

THE
ANGEL
OF THE
Church of Ephesus
NO
BISHOP
OF *EPHESVS*,

Distinguished in Order from, and
Superiour in Power to a
PRESBYTER.

By CONSTANT JESSOP Minister of the
Word at *Fifeild in Essex.*

Mark. 9. 34, 35.

34. *But they held their peace, for by the way they had disputed among themselves who should be greatest.*
35. *And he sat down, and called the twelve, and said unto them, If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all, &c.*
-

LONDON, Printed, and are to be sold at the Crane
in Pauls Churchyard. 1660.

THE
MAGAZINE

OF THE

Church of England

NO.

1815

OF THE YEAR

1815

BY J. B. BERRY

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE



TO THE RIGHT WORSHIPFULL
WILLIAM TWISSE,

Dⁿ in Divinitie, the Reverend & Learned
Prolocutor, and to the rest of the Religious
and Grave Divines of this present Assembly,
summoned by the authoritie of the Lords and
Commons in Parliament.

Right Reverend and honoured Bishops and Brethren,

Never thought or intended to appeare in print in
this learned and criticall age, being conscious to my
self of mine own insufficiencies: I speak it not in an
humble arrogancie, as the Orator observed some did
write treatises against vain-glory, and then in a vain-glorious
ostentation put their names thereto. Much lesse should I have pre-
sumed to handle this controversie, which hath been so fully agita-
ted by others both at home and abroad. Not only by those amongst
us, who have distasteth the Hierarchicall frame of government,
whose arguments have been by the Prelates answered for the most
part no other way then by suspensions, silencings, deprivations,
and proceedings against them as disturbers of the Churches peace,
and contemners of the commands of Authoritie: but also by almost
all the Divines of note in the Reformed Churches, in their Pole-
micall dissertations against Papiists, out of whose Magazine our
Hierarchists have borrowed those weapons whereby they defend
their own authority, and oppose their enemies; as is evident to
any that shall compare the writings of the one and of the other,
and (to say nothing of this as objected by the good old Non-con-
formitans to the Patrons of Prelacie) is acknowledged by the Pa-
pists

The Epistle Dedicatorie.

In Iohn 20. 17.

1 Cor. 15. 10.

gists themselves, witnesse that short marginall Annotation of the
Rhemists, The Protestants otherwise denying this preemi-
nence of Peter, yet to uphold their Archbishops do avouch
it against Puritans. The course of my studies when once I became
a Smatterer in Divinitie, was bent another way then to the handling
of Controversies. My principall and chiefeest aime being this,
that I might through Gods blessing on mine endeavours be fitted
for a Pastorall employment, whensoever the Lord in his due time
should call me therunto. Wherein I desire in humility and thank-
fulnesse to say with S^r PAUL, By the grace of God, I am
what I am. As for this controversie in particular though I had
some reason to have prised into it, in regard of my fathers suffer-
ings more then once under the Prelates, in whose deprivation I
and the rest of his posteritie have had our share of sufferings also,
yet knowing mine own inabilities to wade through it, wanting
time in regard of other studies more necessarie for the fitting of
me for that calling wherein I was, and observing my fathers own
temperature & carriage, who forbore discoursing of it in private,
or mentioning much lesse handling of it in publike, meely on this
ground, that he might fulfill his ministry in that remote barren,
(in respect of the Word) rude, and ignorant corner of Wales, to
which the Lord by his providence removed him, I did also for-
bear the studying of it. The practises of the Prelates which caused
such commotions in Scotland at first, and in the issue the abjura-
tion of the Prelacie, the proceedings against D^r Bastwick here
in England for his Flagellum Latiatum episcoporum, and
those high challenges which were made in the Star-chamber
Speeches about that time, did first cause me to enquire into that
tenure of Divine right, by which our Bishops laid claim to their
Preeminence. The Oath in the Canons which came forth after-
ward did provoke me to set to the work a little closer, which yet I
entred on only for my own private information and satisfaction,
and after the considering of some places of Scripture, I addressed

my

The Epistle Dedicatorie.

my self to Bishop Halls Treatise on that subject, conceiving that in him being the latest that did write, and withall a man of note in the Church, I should find the substance, strength and fineness of all those arguments which could be produced in this cause. Whom when I did peruse, the more I looked into his treatise, the further off I was from receiving satisfaction by him in that Tenure of Divine right, and from subscribing to his assertions. Hereupon for my own private use I set down some short marginall animadversions (and to speak the truth, as far as I am able to judge, there is roome enough in the margin to answer the whole booke) divers of which are now at the desire of some godly and learned members of your Assembly presented to publike view. Sundry other Collections I had once, but S^r Arthur Astons upholders of the Protestant Religion finding my papers, when they rifled my house at Reading of what they could, soon made an end of them by fire, and with them of some Treatises of my Fathers, in this and other arguments, which (in regard of that employment in the Ministry which lay on me whilst I was in those parts) I had not read over. Being thus driven from my habitation, and by losse of my Papers and Manuscripts disabled from dealing in that controversy, I had quite laid aside the thoughts of it, untill that coming before a Committee of your Assembly, according to an order of the house of Commons, I was by the Chairman of that Committee appointed to handle before you this Text, and controversy, out of it. Which I perswade my selfe was done rather by way of Probation then out of any desire of Information from me, who am far more fit to be informed, and to receive, then to give information or satisfaction. Being thus cast on a necessity of reviving my former notions, and reviewing my marginall animadversions with some other observations (which I had left) I undertook the task, and presented before you those collections and arguments, which you were pleased immediately to call for. Let that I beseech you, Fathers and Brethren, now find a second, which found a former.

The Epistle Dedicatorie.

acceptance at your hands, and unto acceptation vouchsafe to adde a Patronage. Something I have indeed now added which was not in my former papers delivered, which I have done partly by the intimation of him by whose appointment I first did enter on the discussing of this question; partly because I saw the great confidence of the Bishop with whom I principally deale in this vexatious dispute, whose grounds I held it in some respect necessary to consider and examine. If in these papers there be any thing which may be subservient to the glory of God, and his great work which he hath in hand, I have my desire, and shall therein rejoyce, desiring to returne all to him from whom every good gift proceeds. Give me leave to close my Dedication with the same petitions which closed my Sermon in your Assembly. The God and Father of our Lord Iesus Christ the Father of mercies grant that his Spirit of peace and truth may be the President of your Assembly, that the peace of God may rule in your hearts whereunto ye are called in one body, and nothing may be done amongst you through strife, vain glory or contention, but ye may seek the truth, and speake the truth in love; that so through his blessing on your endeavours, studies, conferences, meditations, the breaches may be made up which are in the Church, and the Lord in his due time heale the breaches of our Land, Kingdome and Nation, which are exceedingly shaken; which is the hearty desire, and daily prayer of
The meanest of your Fellow-helpers
Eifield, March 6.

Constant Jessop.



THE
Angel of the Church
OF EPHESVS
NO BISHOP
 of Ephesus, &c.

Reverend Sir,
 To the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, write.

IT is not unknowne unto you, Reverend and beloved Fathers and Brethren, what vexatious disputes have been between the Prelatists and Presbyterians concerning the Angels mentioned in the Inscription of this, and the other Epistles. Dr Downham hath undertaken to prove the Angels to be Diocesan Bishops, and to justify their function as lawfull and of divine institution and approbation: but his Refuters both in Latine and English have (as I conceive with submission to better judgements) made it evident that notwithstanding the Doctors bold adventure

Magnus rancore exorbitavit, he hath come short of his undertakings. Yea some of the members of this grave and learned Assembly have vindicated this place from those challenges which the humble Remonstrant made unto it, by it to uphold the tottering cause of Prelacy. A cause which not long agoe in Scotland, and lately in the Parliament of England, and amongst you hath

• Sermon preached at Lambeth, Apr. 17. 1608.
 • *Gesfau Ba- cer. dissert. de gub. eccl.*
 • An Answer to Dr Downham's imprinted, an. 1609.

• Answer to Dr Downham's defence imprinted, an. 1609.
 • The Diocesan tried, by M. P. B. B. an. 1611.

hath been, and still is *causa conclamata*. I doubt not but you are sufficiently satisfied in conscience and judgement, otherwise you would not in so solemn a manner have vowed and covenanted with the Lord the extirpation of that Prelaticall forme of Government. It may be the Prelates themselves see their owne ruine approaching, and that the down-fall of their honour is at hand, in which regard being either not willing or not able by Scripture and force of argument to uphold it, they will now try whether it may be defended by the dint of sword. As if they were the Successours of those Prelates mentioned by *Marfilinus*

c Quibus adijce novum elemosine modum, quod in mercenaria militis, equites & pedes horum plurima consumuntur a pugnas inter Christi fideles concitandas & continue nutriendas, ut eos sue tandem subijcere valeant potestati. De Fel. L. pag. part. 2. cap. 24. pag. 358.

d Baleus in Tul. d. cited by Dr. Abbott 2. part of def. of the Ref. Catho. p. 11.

e Bishop Hall, Epist. by divine right. p. 121.

f *Primum 3. cap. 1. v. 1. Arguuntur de his Epistolis, quod in his non minus frequens quam in aliis Epistolis Joannis de specialibus quas ad septem Ecclesiis Angelat seu Episcopos scripsit. originem saltem apostolicam involvit debet.*

Patavinus, who found out *novum elemosyna modum*, a new kinde of almes to expend those meanes which were given them for hospitallie and charitie to the poor, in the maintinace of souldiers, troops of horses, and companies of foot, in the raising and prosecuting of warres betwixt Christians, that so they might at length subiect them to their tyrannicall power: Or else the sonnes of that *Marcell Popes*, the second, who finding that his Bule and Excommunications would not presvale, went in his own person to warre against the French King, and crossing the river *Tiberis*, cast *Peters* keyes into the streame with indignation; being resolved to try, whether *Peters* sword would helpe him.

I am not now to follow them, or lead you into the fields where trumpets sound, troops are mustered, and instruments of death to fly abroad, but to enquire (by your appointment) whether the Inscription of this and other Epistles afford any solid argument for the pretended preeminence and superiority of a Bishop in Order, Office and Power of Jurisdiction above a Presbyter. A late Patron of Episcopacie is so confident, that he tels us, "All the *Isists* in the world cannot elude it; that *St. John* was by the Spirit of God commanded to direct his seven Epistles to the Bishops of those seven famous Churches, by the name of so many Angels. And the

Romish Apologist for Bishops is as confident as they English Patron for he hath very boldly delivered us, that the argument drawn from this place will inevitably prove their originall to be at least Apostolicall.

Episcopos Angelat seu Episcopos scripsit. originem saltem apostolicam involvit debet.

You

You heare their positions. Let us now consider what just ground there is for this their great confidence.

1. The name *Angel* doth not import any such eminencie of Order or Superioritie of power as our Prelates plead for, and would fain wrest from the words of the Text. You know, Reverend and Beloved, that ἄγγελος *Angel* is a name of Office not of Order, a title importing Dutie not Superioritie in Power. It signifieth a Messenger, and in point of Embassage all that are Gods Ministers (unlesse they have an immediate call from God, and infallible inspiration, neither of which I conceive our Prelates will challenge to themselves) are equall. They are all by their place and Office *Messengers of the Lord of hosts*. It is their dutie to ^h declare the whole counsell of God, and keep back nothing which is profitable: ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀποστόλοις, ⁱ We are Embassadors for Christ, saith the Apostle of himself, and all thole which are entrusted with the dispensation of the Gospel. And from this their function they have their denomination ^k ἀποστόλοι. This name of Office, *Angel*, the Lord is pleased here to make use of rather then any other, for this reason as I conceive; Though the whole Scripture be the *Epistle of the Almighty God unto his creature*, as ^l Gregorie speaks; yet here are now speciall Letters to the Churches from the Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore his Amanuensis *S^c John* is commanded to direct them ^m τῷ ἄγγελῳ, To the Angel or Messenger, to him that is the ⁿ mouth of Jesus Christ to interpret and declare his will. The direction is thus let down indefinitely, not pointing out any singular or individuall person, to give us to understand that whosoever he be that is ἄγγελος by his Place and Office, an Angel or Messenger, it is his dutie to declare the will of the Lord Jesus Christ in the following particulars to the Church. Let this little (which, as hath been observed, sets forth the Function of that Person which is invested with it, not any order in that Function,) be duly considered, and it will cast dirt in the faces of those who so eagerly contend for the appropriation of it to the men of their order. If the Bishop and he alone is the Angel, the Messenger and mouth of Jesus Christ, how bad a case had the Church been in, in these latter dayes, how justly might *England* have joyned with ⁿ *Clement* in his desire, *Oh*

figure in Angelum lucis. Utinam hi diebus Angeli lucis non sint transfigurati in virarum. Nic. de Clem. transl. de nov. cel. brit. non infir. p. 157. edit. Lugd. Bat. an. 1600.

B

that

^h Mal. 1.7.

^h Ag. 20. 17.
20.

ⁱ 2 Cor. 5. 19.

^k ἀποστόλῶν enim
utrum significat
et senem, et
legatum, sive
Scapula.
^l Regist. ep. lib.
4. epist. 40. ad
Theod. Medi-
cum.

ⁿ Jer. 15. 19.

ⁿ Dicit Aposto-
lus Angelū Sa-
tane se trans-
figuros in
Angelos ten-

that the Angels of light (i.e. those which should have been such) had not been in these dayes transfigured into the angels of darkness: How truly that observation of *Espericus* concerning the Bishops in his time hath been verified of the most of ours, let the world judge; ° He tells us that heretofore it was accounted a very strange thing to find a non-preaching Bishop, but in these times, saith he, to finde a preaching Bishop *plus quam monasticam haberetur*, would be esteemed more then monstrous. When the Rhemists in their annotations on the former Chapter had observed, *The Bishops are the starrs of the Church*: our learned *Falke* returns them this answer, St John by the Angels of the Churches meaneth not all that should wear a Myrrour on their heads and hold Crozier staves in their hands like deavils, but them that are the faithfull Messengers of the Lords Word, and utter and declare the same. Had the Inscription been *et emine* how would our Prelaticall men have wanted? you should have heard the same from them—*Invento populus quod clamat Osyri*: We have found it, we have found it, when from a metaphorical notion, and such a denomination as is common to all Ministers, because used in the singular number, they doe thus triumph. Yet they are not, I perswade my selfe, ignorant that not only ° *Hierome* (their back friend, as they conceive) doth, as I have done before, interpret this denomination Angel, and gives his reason for it; but that with ° *Gregorie* the Great, a Bishop and Pope of Rome, The Inscription *Angelis Ecclesiarum*, To the Angels of the Churches, is expounded thus, *Prædicatoribus popolorum*, To the Preachers of the people. So that in the judgement of these Divines the Inscription comprehends all those who are sharers in this title of Office, and are by it differenced, not one from the other joyned in the same Commission of Embassage, but from the Church or people unto whom in the name of the Lord they are to performe the Office of Angels or Messengers. Thus much is indeed granted by our Hierarchists, though with some additional fancies of their own; for they tell us, that *All the Presbyters of these Churches were Angels in respect of their Ministry*, yet (forsooth) one was the Angel in respect of his fixed superiority. There were thousands of starrs in this firmament of the Asian Churches, there were but seven of the first magnitude. We heare them say so, but still the question is how this is proved, and the assertion made good.

In.

• *Esperic. digres.*
in 1. ad Tim. l. 2.
c. 2. p. 177. edit.
Lutet. an. 1619.
v. in Apoc. c. 1.
v. 20.

• *Angelus, i.e.*
nuncius Sacerv-
dos Dei verissi-
mi dicitur, quia
Dei et hominibus
sequester est,
ejusque ad pop-
ulum nuntiat
voluntatem,
in Mal. 2.
1 Moral. in Job.
lib. 34. c. 7. edit.
Basileæ 1564.

• *Episc. by div.*
right p. 122.

In which regard to this their peremptory assertion, it were sufficient for me to give at present no other answer, then that short marginall animadversion which * *Orthwinus Gratianus* gives to that silly Friar *William of Woodford* (who being pressed by the authority of *Hierome* and *Armachanus*) alledged by *Wickliffe*, that before schismes did arise in the Church, matters were governed by common counsell of the Presbyters, which in that respect were all equall, returned thereto this answer, That schisme began in the Apostles dayes, (as it is manifest in the Scripture) *He saith it is manifest in the Scripture, but proves nothing.* And *Minus ubi legitur auctor de illo schismate.* I wonder where the Author reads concerning that schisme. By the way observe that from this simple *Ignoramus* the forementioned Fryer, (who undertook to write against *Wickliffe*, that he might the better engratiate himselfe in the eyes of that persecuting Prelate *Thomas Arundel* Archbishop of Canterbury) Dr *Danham* and Bishop *Hall* our Hierarchicall Rabbines for learning have borrowed that simple evasion, as if that *Hierome* using the phrase of the Apostle, by which he sets forth the schismes and divisions which were in his time in the Church of Corinth, did point out the time when this Prelation of a Bishop above the Presbyters began, to wit, in the Apostles dayes. Which how vain and weak it is, yet, how inconsistent with and contradictory unto what is by *Hierome* delivered in those places, is sufficiently discovered by sundry * *Divines*, to whom I referre the Reader, if he please to peruse the quotations in the margin. I returne to the application and pressing of the forementioned short marginall animadversion; and would faine know of our Prelaticall men where doth the holy Ghost intimate this Hierarchie of Angels, some Angels ministerially, others Angels by a fixed superiority. Where doth St *John* in all this vision give the least hint of such a distinction of Starres, that some are starres of the first, some of the second or third magnitude? Or where in all the Scripture is the name of starres restrained unto Bishops. Is it in St *Jude* * *angelus magnus, wandring starres to whom is reserved blackesse of darknesse for ever:* or is it afterward in the Revelation, when the holy Ghost tellerh us the dragon did draw down the third part of the starres with his tail? Doe not our Prelatits reason almost as wisely and as solidely from this place and notion for their dignitie and superiority: of order and

* *Falsis rerum exper. fol. 104.*

* *Dicit in scriptura parere sed nihil probat.*

* Dr *Danham*'s Sermon at *Leberb*, p. 88, 89. Bishop *Hall*, Episc, by div. right, p. 192.

* *Chamier. Pan. strat. tom. 2. l. 9. de Occ. Pont. c. 5. n. 16. Whitak. cont. 4. q. 1. c. 3. sect. 29. Wal. Mess. disert. de presb. et episc. cap. 4. p. 242. ad p. 249.*

* *Jude ver. 13.*

* *Rev. 12. 4.*

of power, as once the Canonist *Hofiensis*, and after him *Andreas Siculus Barbarius* desiring to curry favour with *Bessarion*, did, who undertook to prove the Divine Institution of Cardinals from that place of Scripture, * *Domini sunt cardines terre*. And albeit the Lawyer thought he gave a witty reason for his conceit, because as the doore in its motion is guided by the hinges whereunto it is fastned, and whereupon it hangeeth, so the Church of Rome is governed by the counsell of Cardinals, yet *Polydore Virgil* gave him this censure, which by the bare change of the name of the persons censured I shall apply to our present purpose. These Lawyers, said he, these Prelatists, say I, stretch Scripture as they please, just as the Shoe-maker doth his leather with his teeth, to fit it to his Last.

2. It is granted by Bishop *Hall* as an undoubted truth, that * in each of these Churches there were many Presbyters, as for instance that of *Ephesus*; yet but one Angel, saith he, that is to say, but one Bishop. But soft and faire my Lord. The same place of Scripture which makes it unquestionable that there were many Presbyters in the Church of *Ephesus*, doth as apparently declare the pluralitie of Bishops, and so the identitie of Bishops both in name and office. Thus much is yeelded by the same * Patron of Episcopacie, that the Elders which *Paul* sent for from *Ephesus* to *Miletum*, and to whom his speech is directed, were indeed Bishops, which he doth grant from those words of the Apostle; *Whereof the holy Ghost hath made you Bishops*. But forsooth they were not all Bishops of *Ephesus*, but of different Territories, of farre dispersed charges, and how is all this proved: we heare *S^t Paul* say; *To all amongst whom I have gone preaching the Kingdome of God*: very magnificently, & *inquam ecclesia Episcopali*, Episcopall dictates out of an Episcopall chaire, to which all must yeeld an implicite faith, and blinde beliefe. Belike *S^t Paul* held now an Archiepiscopall visitation, and albeit the Archbishops court were to be held at *Miletum*, yet from *Ephesus* by some Gentleman Apparitor, or other the Monitory Summons or Processees were sent forth to the severall Diocesses — *Risum seneaeis amici*. Who can almost refraine laughter at the very hearing or reading of such ridiculous conceits. By the way let us take notice of one thing, that to this Archiepiscopall visitation not the inferiour Ministers, but the Diocesan Bishops themselves

* 1 Sam. x.

† De Invent.

ver. lib. 4. c. 9.

p. 290. edit. Ba-

silan. 1555. vi-

de, non fecim^{us} i

urisconsultis

aliquoties de-

torquent sacras

literas quo vo-

lunt, ac suaves

solent sordidas

dentibus exten-

dere peller.

* Loc. cit. p. 122.

* p. 119.

selves were summoned and cited. The evasion is so weak that I am loth to spend time and tire your patience in refutation of it. Onely give me leave to say somewhat to it. 1. Had these Presbyters been Bishops of farre dispersed charges in Asia and different Territories, the holy Evangelist and Historian would rather have said *ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν* Of the Churches, then *ἡ ἐκκλησία* Of the Church. We finde the Apostle in the like cases using the plurall number. The Churches of Asia, *Rom. 16. 19*. The Churches of God in Judea, *1 Thef. 2. 14*. The Churches of Macedonia, *2 Cor. 8. 1*. 2. Though it be not said expressly that these Elders or Presbyters were onely the Presbyters of the Church of Ephesus, yet the circumstances of the text will clearely (as I conceive with submission to better judgments) evince it to be so. The Evangelist *S. Luke* describing *Pauls* journey to Hierusalem, saith ^b *We came to Miletum, For Paul determined to saile by Ephesus that he might not tarry in Asia, for he hastened if it were possible for him to be at Hierusalem at Pentecoste. And sending from Miletum unto Ephesus he called together the Elders of the Church.* To these Elders of the Church he doth appeale as witnesses of his fidelitie and industrie in preaching the word, in serving the Lord with all humilitie, teares and in many temptations. Now, consider where was the place of *Pauls* abode and residence amongst them; was it not Ephesus? the former passages of the historie tell us so in plain termes; that there he continued by the space of two yeares, so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord *Jesus*, both Jewes and Greekes. Ephesus you see was the place of *Pauls* residence in Asia; here he gathered the Church, in the planting and setting of which he continued amongst them by the space of two yeares, In being the place in which the Church was gathered must be also the place of residence of the Elders of the Church. 3. If Interpreters either Greeke or Latine, Ancient or Modern be consulted, we shall finde them all accounting these Presbyters to be Presbyters of no other Church then the Church of Ephesus. By the cleare evidence of which place sundry Divines of all sorts doe prove the Identitie and Indistinction of Bishops and Presbyters both in name and Office in sacred Writ. In which regard I cannot but wonder with what face our Pretenders to Antiquitie for the distinction of their Order from a Presbyter, doe venture to obtrude so novell a fancie on their Readers.

^a Act. 10. 17.
^c seq.

act. 10. 17.

^d 1 Cor. 16. 19.
^e 1 Cor. 16. 19.
^f Chap. 19. 10.

ders and seduced followers. For of how green antiquitie are *Buck-*
ride and *Barlow* with their follower *Dr Hall*, that their Dictates
 must beare sway against the current of Interpreters, not one Divine
 of note being produced (for ought that I could yet reade or heare)
 in favour of this ridiculous evasion, which was I am perswaded ne-
 ver heard of in the Christian Church, till of late *Hieromonarchici*
astri, (as *Spallartus* styles the Papalines, and we may not un-
 fully stile our Prelates) vented these their dreames, that by these their
 groundlesse fancies they might the better uphold their own honour
 and dignities; so that we may justly retort the Proverbe applied
 by one of them to Mr *Brightmans* conjectures, on their own heads.
I have no bed say what some hearers think. 4. There is no colour
 of reason or obscurity in such an interpretation of those words,
I will amongst whom I have gone preaching the Kingdom of
God, as if it must be understood of *Pauls* travelling from Diocesse
 to Diocesse, for the Text affords in plain termes another, the Apo-
 stle puts them in cities where he had done, that he had taught
 them and preached amongst them *Sicilia* *Lydia* *and* *phrygia* *and*
from house to house *his* *still* *in* *to* *all* *men* *as* *they* *had* *done*
ye *all* *the* *in* *captions* *be* *in* *the* *singular* *number* *is* *expressed* *to*
the *angel* *yet* *that* *do* *not* *prove* *to* *be* *spoken* *unto* *or* *meant*
of *one* *individuall* *person* *He* *saies* *a* *truth* *whys* *said* *Seven* *in*
plural *form* *or* *may* *signifie* *seven* *unities* *whether* *singular* *or* *plu-*
regative *Seven* *in* *plurall* *times* *of* *person* *who* *are* *so* *united* *as* *if*
they *were* *one* *And* *it* *is* *a* *frequent* *in* *Scripture* *to* *note* *by* *an* *unity*
in *united* *multitude* *Now* *for* *as* *much* *as* *this* *is* *gain* *said* *by* *our*
Hieromarchists *as* *a* *ridiculous* *evasions* *I* *will* *therefore* *confirm* *it*
against *their* *condemnation* *and* *endeavour* *to* *make* *it* *evident* *that*
under *one* *many* *may* *be* *many* *are* *meant* *This* *is* *the* *language* *and*
usuall *stile* *of* *the* *holy* *Ghost* *10* *In* *regionall* *speeches* *Daniel* *in* *the*
narration *and* *interpretation* *of* *the* *Kings* *dream* *saith* *to* *Nebu-*
chadnezzar *Thou* *art* *the* *head* *of* *gold* *after* *thee* *shall* *rise* *ano-*
ther *Kingdome* *in* *subur* *unto* *thee* *The* *speech* *is* *directed* *to* *Ne-*
buchadnezzar *in* *his* *own* *person* *yet* *under* *one* *many* *are* *meant*
for *not* *he* *alone* *but* *all* *the* *Kings* *precedent* *and* *succeeding* *in* *that*
Monarchie *are* *the* *head* *of* *gold* *as* *Interpreters* *doe* *unanimously*
consent *It* *is* *said* *in* *the* *verse* *following* *After* *thee* *shall* *another*
Kingdome *rise* *yet* *all* *that* *have* *any* *insight* *in* *history* *both* *sacred*
 and

d 26. 10. 10.

e Baime; Dio-
celans; Trill
pg. 17.

f Dan. 2. 38.

and profane doe know that the Persian Monarchie, which is the Kingdome there spoken of, did not arise immediately upon the death of *Nebuchadnezzar* the Great, to whom this dreame, and interpretation of it is made knowne, but upon the death of *Belshazzar* his Grand-childe. So that under the Person of one, many of the same order and degree are here necessarily to be understood.

The Lord represents to *Zechariah* in a vision *four hornes which did scatter Judah and Jerusalem, and foure Carpenters which were sent to fray them away*, and to repaire Jerusalem. Will any

sober man hence conclude the Persons which scattered Judah were individually foure, no more nor no lesse, and the Repairers of Jerusalem just foure and no more? yet this inference will hold as well as that which our Prelates make from this vision in the Revelation.

Christ holdeth in his hand seven starres, which seven starres are the Angels of the Churches, therefore the Angels of the Churches are just seven and no more. They may with as much colour of reason

and truth extort another conclusion also thus: Christ holdeth in his hand seven starres of the first magnitude and none but them, which seven starres are the Angels by a fixed superiority. There-

fore Christ hath care of the direction and protection of none but the Bishops, which are the starres of the first magnitude, the Angels by a fixed superiority. Take one instance more. When the A-

postle speaks of that grand Apostate Antichrist, he speaks of him in the singular number, *That man of sinne, the sonne of perdition*, now albeit the Romish Cardinall doe from the article

prefixed, when he is stiled *adversarius et inimicus*, that man of sinne, the sonne of perdition, that wicked one, plead for a restriction to one individuall person, and wonder at it that none of the adversaries doe take notice of it, notwithstanding all their skill in the tongues,

of which they so much boast; yet how ridiculous a conceit this is you all know. Our Polemicall Divines have sufficiently discovered the falshood and vanitie of this assertie; of which I may truly say as our learned *Fulke* doth in his

reply to the *Rhemists* (who trod in the steps of their fellow Jesuite fore-mentioned) *This is so false that young children, which have scarce tasted of the Greek tongue, are able to disprove it by infinite*

Examples.

5 Chip. 1. 18;

19, 20, 21.

It any desire more instances of this kinde, for the confirmation of this,

I refer him to the reply to Dr. *Dowdams* defence, part 1. l. 3. c. 1. sect. 7.

l. 3. c. 1. sect. 7.

1. 1. Thel. 2. 3.

1. Bell ubi de Rom. Pont. 2. K. Secundus locus Graeci contra- busi significationem ad unum veniunt, ut *adversarius* hominem singularem significat, et quantum est verbum adversariorum, qui tamen sunt linguae peritiam, hoc ad- mittere.

in 2. Thel. 3. ver. 3. caput 8.

Matth. 16. 19.

^m de rep. eccles.
lib. 1. cap. 7. n. 3.

ⁿ Tract. 50. in Evang. Iohann. Judas malum corpus malorum significat, quando Petrus corpus bonorum, corpus ecclesie, imò corpus ecclesie, sed in bonis: nam si in Petro non esset sacramentum Ecclesie, non ei diceret Dominus, Tibi dabo claves regni celorum.
^o Tract. 124. in idem Evang. Ecclesie Petrus Apostolus propter Apostolatum sui primatum gerebat figuratè generalitate personam. Quod enim ad ipsum proprie pertinet, natura unus homo erat, gratia unus Christianus, abundantiore gratia unus idemq; primus Apostolus: sed quando ei dictum, Tibi dabo claves regni celorum, univèrsam significabat ecclesiam.

^p Loc. cit. n. 4.
& seq.

2. In other places of Scripture where the speech is directed unto one, yet under that one others of the same order and societie are meant. Our Saviour Christ said to Peter, ¹ *I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdome of Heaven*; though at Rome under the Popes nose, in a conclave of Cardinals, the limitation of this to Peters person (as Christs Vicar) would be readily embraced, yet you all know, Reverend and Beloved, how repugnant this is to Scripture: in which regard he would be hooted at, as having a Pope in his belly, that should in any Reformed Church confine the power of the Keys to Peters person: Yea, ^m *Antonius de Dominis* will tell us, that it would be a monstrous thing indeed to deny that our Lord did there direct his speech to Peter, and promise him the Keys, which he did afterwards infallibly conferrè on him; But it would be monstri majoris familie, more monstrous by farre, so to limit this promise and the execution thereof unto Peter, as that it should imply an exclusion of the rest of the Apostles. Hence divers of the Fathers have observed that there under the Person of One, to wit, Peter, to whom the speech is primarily directed, is an united multitude, the Church, to be understood. Thus *Austin* sundry times

speaks. ⁿ *Wicked Judas signifieth the body of the Wicked, as Peter the body of the good, the body of the Church which consisteth of the good*, otherwise the Lord would not say to him, *I will give unto thee the Keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven*. And elsewhere, ^p *Peter in respect of himself was properly by nature one man, by grace one Christian, by a more abundant grace one and the same a chief Apostle*. But when it was said to him, *I will give unto thee the Keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven*, he did signifie the Whole Church, &c. So, he, more testimonies might be produced,

but these are sufficient; he that desireth to see this truth confirmed by more suffrages of the ancients may consult *P Spalatensis*, and receive abundant satisfaction. As then in the fore-mentioned speech of our Saviour under one, a collected body of Apostles and Beleevers is understood, so here by one Angel is meant the united body of Angels, and what is spoken unto one is to be understood as spoken to all

all of them, as by their place they are Angels. For the denomination is used here that it points out rather *the person* than the *person* as our industrious and learned Countryman Mr. Foxe hath observed. To pass from this Instance to another. When the Apostle speaking concerning the usefulness of the Scripture, that it is profitable for doctrine, for reproofe, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, addes this as a principall end of all, *that the man of God might be perfect*, is this, thank you, spoken concerning the perfecting of one man of God alone, or of all that are such by their place and calling? When the same Apostle gives this charge to Timothy, *Thou O man of God see these things*: dost he not in the person of Timothy lay this charge upon all the Ministers of the Gospel, who share in that honourable title and function? What shall we say then to those which would make us to believe that what is here spoken to the Angel (a name of Office common to all the Ministers of Jesus Christ) is to be understood as spoken unto one, a Bishop and him that sitteth in the throne. With the same strength of argument, and as much colour of reason might a Romanist inferre, because the Lord saith in the singular number of the Priest, *Thy Priests lips shall preserve knowledge, and they shall seek the Law at his mouth, for he is the Messenger of the Lord of hosts*. And *The man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken to the judgement of the Priest, shall surely be cut off from the Law, his man shall dye*. Though all Priests are Angels or Messengers of the Lord in respect of their Ministerie, yet there is one Priest that is the Messenger of Angel by a fixed superiority, and at his mouth you must enquire; to wit, the Pope, you are not (I know) ignorant that thus some have argued and what our Divines have answered them their writings doe declare; both Dr. Heylin in his Conference with Huri, and the learned Frenchman Rivinus in confutation of Bailie the Jesuite.

3. Let us consider sundry passages in the Epistles themselves; in to the bowels of which if we diligently looke we shall finde that albeit the inscription be in the singular number, To the Angel; yet the Angel was more then one distinct and individual person; and that the denomination is not to be taken Singularity or Personally; but *collectively* including an united multitude. In the Epistle to Thyatira the Inscription is as in the rest

1 Tim. 3. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

1 Tim. 6. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

Mal. 2. 7.

Deut. 17. 12.

Chap. 6. div. 1. p. 152.

Sum. cont.

part. 1. 4. 8. p. 127, 128.

record in the whole Booke of God, or any other history. That of *Aspin* is most consonant to the truth, who doth thus paraphrase the Comminatory sentence; *I will remove thy Candlestick*. It will scatter the people for their sines. In which regard the same Father doth afterwards tell us *How* collect the Church the Angels, in which Church hee sheweth there were two parts good and bad; that the praise may be directed to the good; the reprobation to the bad. Thus hee, with more to the same purpose. The same truth is delivered by *Arctas* and *Andreas* Bishops of *Casarea Cappadocea*, the most ancient Interpreters of this Revelation. He calleth the Angel of *Byzantium* the Church that was in *Ephesus*. And both confirm this Interpretation from sundry passages in these Epistles. From whence *St. Basil* (in whom the Reader if he please may see this last quotation at large) drawes this conclusion, *Let this therefore be an undoubted truth; that this argument from the Angels makes nothing to prove that there was but one Bishop in a Church or City.* Thus much of the third argument, I proceed to another.

4. By the Angel in this place is not to be understood a Bishop in Order, Office, and power of Jurisdiction, distinguished from, and superiour to a Presbyter, for there was no such distinction or superiority settled in the Church of Christ before, nor in *St. Johns* time, nor immediately after the Apostles dayes. The truth of this negative assertion I shall endeavour to confirm by these ensuing arguments.

First, in the Word of God, we finde no such difference or inequality in Order and Power between a Bishop and a Presbyter, as is pretended by our Prelates. In prosecuting of which undertaking I will as briefly as I may consider what is delivered by that Patron of Episcopacy, who tells us that *The* imparty of *Over and under* and *Bishop* full Jurisdiction was founded by Christ, created by his Apostles, both by their practise and commandment. In the proofe of which position when he had spent many pages, he concludes with a great deal of assurance that he hath carried all down

c. Hom. 1. in Apoc. Movebo candelabrum tuum i.e. differentem populum pro peccatis.

Angelos ecclesiam dicit, in quibus duas partes, i.e. bonorum & malorum ostendit, ut scilicet bonos, in reprobos ad maiorem dirigant. Sicut dominus in Evangelio. Omne praepositorum corpus unum servum dixit. Item de magnam, quam veniens dominus deus dividet, id. ibid.

Angeli ecclesiam dicit, in quibus duas partes, i.e. bonorum & malorum ostendit, ut scilicet bonos, in reprobos ad maiorem dirigant. Sicut dominus in Evangelio. Omne praepositorum corpus unum servum dixit. Item de magnam, quam veniens dominus deus dividet, id. ibid.

St. Basilus hoc argumentum ad Angelum qui Episcopus denotant, nihil facere ad probandum Episcopos tum fuisse in archibus singulis. It. al. Mess. dissert. in de presb. & Episc. 2. 4. p. 184.

g. Episc. by div. right. p. 91.

1. *Saravia* (a professed patron of Episcopacy and Antagonist to *Besa*, whom our Prelates looke on as their back-friend) doth acknowledge that the *Seventie Disciples* were *Evangelists*, and in that respect by the degree of their calling superior to *Ordinary Bishops*. How then is there I pray you any foundation for the imparitie between a Bishop and a Presbyter laid by Christ in this fact of his choosing Twelve Apostles, and *Seventie Disciples*, when these *Seventie* whom the Presbyters are said to succeed were superior to Bishops themselves? 2. *Spalatenensis* hath observed that these *Seventie Disciples* were not instituted by our Saviour for the perpetual government of the Church, but onely that they had a temporarie Commission

to goe before him into every City and place whither he himselfe would come, which was not renewed to them after their returne with joy, because the devils were made subject unto them, as the Commission (given to the Apostles at first with a limitation, *Go not in-*

to the way of the Gentiles, neither enter into the Cities of the Samaritanes, but goe rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel) was after his resurrection repeated, and enlarged, *Go teach all nations*. In which regard, saith he, I cannot asirme that in them (the 70. Disciples) was the Order of Presbyters instituted directly and immediately. Christs election of the *Seventie Disciples* affords you

see by the confession of the Archbishop of Spalace himselfe no suffooting for the subjection of Presbyters to Bishops; though he would faine claime an institution of Bishops in the Commission given to the Apostles. But thirdly the Canons of *Coleing* speak home to the point, and in plaine termes deny the consequence of this, or that hereupon we should imagine that Bishops

are a distinct Order from Presbyters. *Albani* say they, *Christ did institute twelve Apostles, in whose place the Bishops are, and afterwards chose seventie Disciples, whose place in the Church the Presbyters do hold. Let us must not thinke that Bishops wd constitute in the*

Agnosci Saravia *Septuaginta discipulos* *Evangelistarum dignitate emnise, ac* *proinde Ordinarii Episcopi vocationis gradu antecellasse.* *Chr. Buser p. 515. ex* *Sar. de Min. Ev. grad. cap. 4. in quo*

Peractis hoc primo munere, postquam reversi sunt gaudentes non legationes amplius a Christo missas in Ministerium verbinque novam illis fuisse replicatam commissionem, &c. de rep. Eccl. lib. 2. c. 3. n. 4. *Quam confirmationem quoddam mandatum & generalem missionem, quae a Christo facta est, discipulis non laevata, nec possum affirmare in ipso fuisse directam, proxime & immediate institutum ordinem presbyteralem, &c. id. lib. 2. c. 3. n. 4.*

Luke 10. Matth. 10.

Matth. 28.

Enchir. Christi. relig. in Cons. Col. p. 160. de sacr. ord. edit. Parisian. 1558.

Non est tamen putandum Episcopos aliam in Ecclesia ordinem a Presbyteris constituisse. Nam in primitiva Ecclesia iidem erant, Presbyteri & Episcopi, quod Apostolus Paulus Paris & Pauli epistola dicit, quod Hieronymus, de ceteri sermone ecclesiastici scriptores att-

Church an order different from Presbyters. For in the Primitive Church Bishops and Presbyters were the same, which the Epistles of the Apostles Peter and Paul, &c. Hieronym also, and almost all other ancient Ecclesiastical writers doe testify. In which regard our learned Junius spake a truth, and no more but the truth, when he

Quum patres Episcopos Apostolis, Presbyteros 70. Discipulis succedere affirmarent, nunquam dixerunt eos in istius Christi succedere. Quia nunquam insinuat Christum ut Apostoli secundum gradum in Ecclesia succederent, quia res se ipsas iam Apostolorum functioni et gloria succedenda suis. Hoc autem vitium est rationi adversum, Omnes Dei servi in doctrina Apostolorum succedunt, in gradum eorum neminem adaptavit. 2. cor. Sed et 70. Discipulorum vocatio fuit excoordinata, posita in ordinatione tradita, sicut et Episcopi et Presbyteri officio in istis actibus, quibus sunt attributi, quando ergo inquit dixerunt hoc illos succedere, nempe humanam et non divinam institutionem, analogica ratione quam non autem propriam imitationem communi gradum, non singulari necessitas ecclesie. Succedere igitur ex simili non autem pari, hoc illi inhere Patres, quia gradum in ecclesia non patres, sed similes, non pleni sed quadammodo deficientes putabant alii posse, alii oportere. Signum autem similitudo est, tantum secundum quid et remotissima tamen similitudo est si verè vera, si imaginariè imaginariè, hoc verò secundum quid remotus est et imaginariè similitudo, et qua sequi absolute concludunt absolute fallaciam. contrav. § lib. 1. cap. 14. not. 15.

when the Fathers said the Bishops succeed the Apostles, and the Presbyters succeed the Seventie Disciples, they never said they did succede one the other by Christs Institution, but by humane or Divine Ordinance. They said they did succede them because some thought, there might be the like degrees after a sort, though not fully the like, be observed in the Church. Yet this likeness is but in some respect a remote and imaginary similitude, from which such he if any doe inferre an absolute conclusion (that it is so, that it ought to be so) they doe absolutely deceive themselves and others. This is the summe of Junius more large and satisfactory answer. By all which hath been said the Reader may easily discern on how uncertain grounds the faith of the Hierarchie is built. Of much more which might be spoken in this subject, I will saye onely one thing. Our Saviours act incorporating the Apostles into one collegiate body (as we may stile them) investing all and each of them with equall power, conferring a Superioritie or Primacy to none of them above his fellowes, doth plainly evince that he laid a foundation for, and gave a platforme of an Aristocraticall not Monarchicall Government in the Church. The Monarchie he hath reserved to himselfe as his peculiar Prerogative; but those to whom he gave a fixed superiority (as our Hierarchists speake) and commission during terme of life, were all conjoynd in an Aristocracy. If any desire a reason why our Saviour Christ was pleased in his Apostles to settle an Aristocraticall Government,

verment, and lay downe this as a standing plat-forme for them
and their successors to follow; the Archbishop of Spalato shall
inform him, to whom we have a full and satisfactory reason:
Eadms. saith he, it is true that in humane Common-wealths a
Monarchie has especially that which is tempered by Lawes is best,
yet in the Church Christ did not think it fit that way should be gi-
ven to a Monarchie, though never so well tempered amongst those
that are his Ministers, this be judged so he worst of all to the
Church. Observe I pray you his reason, for its earnest & great
deale of weight with it. Our Saviour himselfe did well first see how dangerous
it would prove in the Church; that if once a Monarchie did crepe in by stealth
which is manifestly may be tyrannicall
which is manifestly may be tyrannicall
the Dominie, well known to be a learned
and great Patron of Episcopacie. As this reason given by him ser-
veth to overthrow the Papall Monarchie over the whole Church,
so it doth effectually conclude against an Archiepiscopall over a
Provinciall, so Episcopall Sovereignty over a Diocesan Church. For
indeed there are not many steps betwene a Pope and a Prelate.
Stapleton the Jesuite (if the our Saviour have rightly quoted him)
hath confessed it: an easie manner for an Archbishop, impregnated
with an ambitious dominating spirit, to bring first a Pope, and
the practises of our later Prelates have made it evident to all the
world, that a Diocesan Monarch may quickly become a tyranni-
call petri-Pope. In a word, suppose it should be granted that the
honours promised by our Saviour are thrones Apostolicall and that
thereby is meant that power of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction which
Christ communicated to them, his Extraordinary Delegates and
Embassadours (which yet is very questionable, & divers Divines car-
rying it another way, yea, Spalatenfis affirms the quite contra-
ry, that Christ there speaks not a word of the throne in the
Church) yet what is all his to an Episcopall throne, or to the ad-
vancing of a Prelate above the rest of the Presbyters? What af-
finity is there between an Apostolicall and Episcopall throne, be-
tween an Aristocraticall Government which Christ founded in his
Apostles, and a Monarchicall Sovereignty which Prelates have usurped.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

De rep. Eccl.

lib. 1. c. 10. § 3.

concerning Popish Prelates; * *Like unto them (that speake great swelling words of vanitie) are they which boast that Episcopacie is a state of Perfection. When in the meane time the onely thing they aime at is to be equall to Peeres in pompe, to ride on stately horses, only now and then their Lordships doe consecrate a Temple or an Altar.*

For, if we should looke for the same conditions and qualifications in many of ours, which St. Paul commands to bee in those Bishops

there mentioned by him, we shall finde that we are *in a new world (as Salmeron the Jesuite once spake) and in a strango Church that never heard of Christ and his Apostles.* This by the way. From all that is culled out of these Epistles, the argument by which they

must prove Episcopacie to have been erected by the Apostle longeth with an ussall fallacie, a shamefull begging of the question. For first of all *Timothy* and *Titus* have been sufficiently un-bishop-ped, not onely by him who hath written a particular treatise in that name, but by all that have waded into this controversie, Domestick and Forraigne Divines, against English and Romish Hierarchists, neither hath there been any sacriledge committed by those which have unbishopped them, but they have been restored to the Dignitie of Evangelists, from which the Prelates have sacrilegiously degraded them, that so they might on the ruines of the fore-mentioned Evangelists honour build up their Episcopall Sovereignty. I might be large in proving this, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangelists, but the work is already sufficiently done by others. Onely, I will (least our Hierarchists should say that this is the assertion of none but their opposites) put them in minde what *Antoninus de Dominis* hath observed concerning *Timothie*, long after the first Epistle written to him, even when the Apostle wrote his Epistle to the Romans (which was about the time of his last journey to Hierusalem, as is cleare by paralleling those two places of Scripture, Rom. 15. 25. *Act.* 24. 17, 18.) to wit, that he was out of doubt a generall Bishop, i.e. an Apostle, as yet confined to no certain seat. So that if *Spalatenfis* speake truth, his Episcopacie of Ephesus is gone, for he was not yet saith he confined to any certain See. And as hee

Perinde sunt qui statum episcopalem statum-jactitant perfectionis, quum inter-um nihil agant, quum Satrapae pompa agere, equitare bellas caballas, nisi quod interduum templa consecrant & ara. Mart. in 1. Pet. 2. 18. ex Luth.

Hujusmodi condiciones siqu exalt con- sideret, & conferat cum nostre etatis episcopis, videbitur in novo orbe, & in peregrina aliqua Ecclesia, qua Christum & Apostolos penitus ignoraverit, ut sari- Solm. in Tit. 1. diff. 1. ad 4^{am} dub.

Video Timo- ibidem proculda- bio Episcopum generalem, i.e. Apostolum nuli certe sedi ad- huc assignatum ab ipso Paulo vocari suum adjutorem de rep. Ecc. l. 2. ca. 3. n. 60.

- was not then when *Paul* wrote that Epistle to the Romans, so neither was he when the same Apostle wrote his second Epistle to *Timotheus* himselfe. Consider the charge which the Apostle there gives him; ^a *Doe the works of an Evangelist, make full proof of thy Ministry*; He doth not say, *Doe the works of a Bishop*, then had our Prelatists some colour for their assertions, but *of an Evangelist*, now it is well knowne that the Apostle setteth the *Evangelist* as Persons whose calling was extraordinary above the standing and ordinary governours of the Church, *Pastors and Teachers*. Those are by the Apostle there stiled Evangelists who did *Evangelizare sine Cathedra*, as ^b *Ambrose* speakes, Preach the Gospel up and downe not being confined to Residence on any one peculiar charge. We have *S^t Paul* professing that on him did lye the ^c *Care of all the Churches*, and oft expressing his desire in his own person to come to them to confirme and strengthen their faith, which when he could not do he sent these two (not to mention any more) sometimes to one Church, sometimes to another, but being now imprisoned at Rome, and having since answered before *Nero* already, knowing that he ^d *should never see their faces any more*, as he said to those Elders of Ephesus, that ^e *the time of his departure was at hand*, as he speakes to *Timothy*, he puts him in minde of that Office whereto he was chosen in an extraordinary manner ^f *by the prophesie which were before concerning him*, (For these extraordinary Offices had an extraordinary manner of vocation also (as sundry ^g *Divine* tell us concerning *Timothy*, induced thereto by the forementioned passages of Scripture) *Doe the work of an Evangelist*, which when it was, *Eusebius* doth set forth at large, where he speaks of some who performed it thus; ^h *they did preach Christ to those which had not as yet heard the word of faith, they delivered unto them the holy Scriptures, ordained Pastors, and committed unto them the charge of those which were newly received into the Church, and then they did erect synagogues, synagogs, passe over unto other countries and nations* (Book 7. Chapter 1. Verse 8. & 9.)
- Whereas it is demanded, ⁱ *how should those works of Ordination and execution of Church censures, which are constant and ordinary, and so consequently derivable to all successions; to the end of the world, be imposed upon a meere extraordinary agent; this is a demand so senselesse and voide of all reason that I wonder it should fall*
- ^a 2 Tim. 4. 5.
- ⁱ Ephes. 4.
- ^k 2 Tim. 4.
- ^l 1 Cor. 11. 27.
- ^m Act. 20.
- ⁿ 2 Tim. 4. 6.
- ^o 1 Tim. 1. 14.
- ^p Chap. 4. 14.
- ^q Vide Bez. Aq. Lyr. Espenr. So. to, major. in loc.
- ^r Euseb. Eccl. hist. 4. 3. ca. 24.
- ^s Edit Basil. 1570.
- ^t Bishop Hall, loc. cit. p. 178.

fall from the pen of so learned and grave a Divine as Dr. Hall; but if he desire an answer, I will returne it him in the words of *Servius* (a friend and fellow stickler in their cause) who will informe him; that *The degrees of the Ministers of the Gospel were so distinguished, that the greater did include the Ministeries of the lesser. To the same purpose speaks Cassian (in Ephesus.)* for that whatsoever were the acts of an ordinary and standing Minister of the Gospel, the extraordinary Officer might performe them; albeit the Ordinary officers might not presume with the execution of those which belonged to the extraordinary.

2. If the Precepts given here in charge to *Timothy* and *Titus* concerne a Bishop alone, then doth it concerne a Bishop alone to *Preach the word in season and out of season, to rebuke, to exhort, to give of God that is in him, and not neglect it, to take heed to himself and his doctrine; to flee covetousnesse, and follow after righteousness, godlinesse, faith, love.* These with many other precepts belong also to the Bishop and to him alone. If our adversaries in this cause shall answer, that these are duties belonging to all Ministers wherein they and Bishops doe participate, but the other mentioned by them belong to a Bishop distinct from a Presbyter; I shall returne them the same reply which *Gerfon Bucerus* doth to Dr. *Dunham*, *Quem istius distinctio in auctorem proferimus?* Who hath taught us or them to distinguish? Surely the Apostle hath not, for he makes not the least mention of what belongs to *Timothy* as a Bishop, what to him as a Presbyter; but gives all the commands promiscuously without any difference.

For as much as those charges given to *Timothy* and *Titus* are so much insisted on, to prove their Episcopall Power, and consequently the Power and Preeminence of Bishops above Presbyters by the Apostles practice and recommendation, I will take into consideration some of those which are materiall, and see what strength they afford unto the cause.

1. That command given by the Apostle to *Timothy*, Lay hands suddenly on no man, and his appointing of *Titus* to ordaine Elders in every citie is strongly urged by the sticklers for Episcopall Sovereignty, to prove that the Power of Ordination was in their hands alone. Be these what Elders soever in Ephesus, there hands without a *Timothy* will not serve to ordaine, his without theirs might,

[Grads ministerum evangelii ut jussu distinctos ut majores includerent inferiorum ministeria. Sarad cap. 1. Beza de div. grad. Min. Evang.

[2 Tim. 4. 2. r Ch. 1. 6. 11. Ep. Chap. 4. 4.

u Bucer. p. 183.

2 Pa. 113.

saith Bishop *Hall*; very confidently, but under favour, and with respect to his gray haire, very weakly. Who seeth not how weak an inference this is, *Timothy* is commanded not to ordaine any man suddenly, Therefore *Timothy* alone had power to ordaine: the Consequent may on just ground be denied. The President of a Colledge may be in a letter charged to take heed he admit not suddenly any man to a fellowship in the Colledge, will it therefore follow that the power of Election and admittance is in the hands of the President alone. For as much as this answer of those which are opposites to the Hierarchie, who say that *Timothy* and *Titus* were to ordaine, not by their owne power alone, but by way of Partnership and Societie with the Presbyterie, joyning with them, is rejected by Bishop *Hall*, as being so palpable, and quite against the haire; that he cannot think the authors of it can beleieve themselves: I will therefore endeavour to confirme it, and make it good.

2 Pa. 114.

Since the Bishop will not beleieve what his Opposites say, I would desire to know whether the Bishop doth beleieve that *St Paul* would invest *Timothy* and *Titus* with a greater power than he himselfe, or the Apostles did exercise. Now it is cleare that he did not assume the power of Ordination into his owne hands, to execute it by himselfe, but in it, though he were as President to conduct and guide the action, did conjoyne with himselfe the Presbyters in the Ordination of *Timothy*. For albeit in one place he speaketh of the imposition of his own hands alone, yet in another he mentions the Presbytery as concurring with him in it. Besides, the Ordination of the Presbyters at Antioch, was not the act of *Paul* alone, but *Paul* and *Barnabas* at least, or rather by comparing it with other places, *Paul* and *Barnabas* with the Presbyters of Antioch, did joyne together in the Ordination. The phrase runnes in the plurall number, *When they had ordained them Elders, and had prayed with fasting.* From whence *Gerſon Bucerin* doth argue thus, If the Hierarchists doe on just ground perswade us, that Ordination doth belong to the Bishops, because the Apostles, whom the Bishops (as they say) doe succeed, did ordaine, by the same reason may Presbyters also ordaine, because the 70. Disciples (whom the Presbyters doe succeed, as they informe us) did ordaine. For *Barnabas* is by many Historians reckoned among the 70. Disciples. If we look further into the actions of the Apostles, we shall finde all their Ordina-

c. 1. Tim. 5. 6.

d Chap. 4. 14.

c Act. 14. 23.

f 2^o esser. de.

gub. l. 6. p. 321.

Ordinations not by their own power, but by the joynt consent and concurrence of the Presbyters and Disciples. When *Matthias* was chosen into the roome of *Judas*, *Peter* doth all by the common consent of the Disciples, nothing by his own authority, nothing like a Lord or Prince in a commanding manner, as *Chrysostome* hath observed. So in the Ordination of the ^b Deacons they carry themselves as Presbyters, not as Apostles in the action, permitting the election to the Disciples, concurring with the Presbyters in the Ordination of them. Adde hereunto one instance more out of the book of God. The command of the holy Ghost concerning *Barnabas* and *Saul*. ¹ Separate me *Barnabas* and *Saul* for the worke whereunto I have appointed them. *Paul* had his call to the Apostleship immediately from the Lord some yeares before this; and *Barnabas* his call to the Ministry, for both of them had joyned together in the work of ^b Antioch, but being now by the Lords appointment to goe to the Gentiles, and preach the Gospel unto them (for that seemeth to be the great worke here spoken of by the Lord, as ¹ *Spalatensis* hath rightly observed) they are now commanded to be in a solemne manner set apart for this worke. As the Lord himselfe by a voyce from Heaven gives them their immediate call, and Authoritative Designation for this Office, so their Externall Designation to it they have by his appointment also, not from any one particular person, either Bishop or Presbyter, but from all those in the Church of Antioch which ministred to the Lord; for so *S^c Luke* sets it down, ^m As they ministred to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me *Barnabas* and *Saul*, for the worke whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted, and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. From all which by the practice of the Apostles, and by this voyce of God from heaven, it is cleare, as farre as I can apprehend, that the Power of Ordination or Deputation to the Ministry, and worke of the Lord therein, should not, doth not reside in the hand of any one particular person of what degree soever, either Bishop or Presbyter, but of the collective body of Pastours and Presbyters which minister unto the Lord.

2. If the Bishop will not beleve his Opposites, such as *Parker* that proud Schismaticke, or *Cartwright* and *Ames* with their ignorant and malecontented followers, some giddy corner-creeping

¹ Act. 1.
 ὁ δὲ πᾶσι τοῖς
 μαθηταῖς ἐλά-
 λησεν καὶ ἐπέ-
 τρεξε αὐτοὺς
 3. in Act. 1.
¹ Chap. 6.

¹ Chap. 13. 2.

¹ Chap. 11. 26.

¹ De rep. 6.
 l. 2. c. 12. 13.

^m Cha. 13. 2. 3.

Pag. 60, 61.
C. 148.

upstarts, (these are not mine but Bishop *Halls* titles of honour wherewith he doth bespatter them) if the judgement of Divines of greatest note in the Reformed Churches will strike any stroke, we have them concurring in this, that The Power of Ordination is in the hands of the Presbyters, nor of any one alone; that though these charges are given to *Timothy* and *Titus* in particular, yet doth it not follow that they alone could doe it. I will onely mention one of many that might be alledged, When *Pamelinus* from those places undertakes to prove the Superioritie of Bishops above Presbyters, *Gonlatius* answereth him thus, *"The argument hath not strength enough in it, Presbyters are ordained by Bishops, therefore Bishops are above them. The ancient Bishops were ordained by the Clergie and the people, if any shall thence inferre, therefore the Clergie and people are above the Bishops, Pamelinus and his Schollars will deny the Consequence, Ordination doth not establish a degree or Preeminence, but only sheweth and commendeth the Discipline of the Church."*

* Annot. in Cyp.
ep. 65.

* Gloss. in dist.
66. cap. Porro.

3. Besides Protestants, we have Papists assenting to this truth, and confessing 1. that Presbyters may ordain. *† Johannes Senneca* in his Glosse on the Canon Law, proves it by this, *the Apostles were but Presbyters not Bishops, yet they did ordaine, and in their dayes there was no difference between a Presbyter and a Bishop.* And *† Altiſſiadorensis* hath delivered it, that if there were but three Presbyters in the World, they might ordaine one the other, a bishop and an Archbishop, and gives this reason for it, *Presbyters as well as Bishops doe receive the Keyes of the Kingdome in their Ordination, for they are the successors of the Apostles.* 2. That *Titus* was left at Crete to ordaine Presbyters no otherwise then as a Moderator in the action, and as a Consul or Dictator are said to create Consuls; because they are, they hold, the Comitia or Assembly and meeting in which they are created. Thus *Salmeron*, as I shall afterward shew more at large out of him. By this time I hope it doth appeare that this is not so palpable an elusion as the Bishop is pleased to stile it, but rather to manifest a truth, which the Bishop himself nor all the mitred Fathers of that order are able to disprove. Thus much for Ordination from thole charges, I proceed to the next.

* Anti/San ap.
Apol. Episc. p.
105.

* In Tit. 1.
dist. 1.

* 1 Tim. 5. 15.

That precept of the Apostle, *"Abasist an Elder or Presbyter receive*

received not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses, is mainly insisted on by Dr. Hall and others, to prove that Timothy was invested with Episcopall Jurisdiction, and so to conclude the Jurisdictionall Preeminence of a Bishop over the Presbyters, yet the weakness of this argument hath bin already sufficiently discovered, and the place answered to the full by our Polemicall Divines which have disputed against Papists, from whom our Hierarchists have borrowed most of their weapons which they make use of in this quarrell. It shall be therefore sufficient for me to mention the answer which is given by our Protestant Divines to their Romish Opposites in this cause. First, our Countreyman Dr. Whitakers answereth Bellarmine that this place proves not Timothies power over Presbyters, and from this place observeth that the power of Jurisdiction was not in the hand of one, but of many that were endued with equall authoritie.

According to the meaning of the Apostle to receive an accusation is to acquaint the Church with the crime, and to bring the offender into judgement, openly to reprove which not onely superiours, but equals also, yea and inferiours may doe. The Knights of Rome did not only judge the people, but the Senators and Noble-men also if they were delinquents. Certainly Timothy had no such Consistory or Court as was afterwards attributed to the Bishops. What this authority was may be understood from that which followeth, Them that sin, rebuke before all; which equals also may doe. Thus of old the Bishops, if a Bishop or Presbyter were accused, did referre the matter to the Ecclesiasticall Senate or Synod, and did condemne him if he were found worthy, i. e. they did suspend, excommunicate, or remove him according to the nature of his offence. Thus that Divinitie Professor of Cambridge in his dayes. And that this was the manner of proceeding in administration of Church censures, appears by our Saviours precept concerning other Offenders.

Quod Timotheum jubetur non temere & irre-corte xatroyeclay admittere, hoc non probat Timotheum in Presbyteros potestatem aut dominationem habuisse. Nam ex Apostoli mente xatroyeclay neglexit est crimen ad Ecclesiam deferre, reum in judicium adducere, potestatem reprehendere, quod non modo superiores possunt, sed aequales etiam atq; inferiores. In Romana Repub. Equites non de populo tantum sed etiam de Senatoribus & Patriciis judicabant. Et certe non videtur Timotheum tale consistorium aut forum habuisse, quale post Episcopos in Ecclesia constitutum fuit, nam hi Presbyteri non alii quam Episcopi fuerunt ut ex Apostolo constat. Quatuor hac auctoritas fuerit ex eo quod sequitur intelligi potest, Eos qui peccant coram omnibus edoce, quod aequales quoq; possunt. Sic olim Episcopi si qua Presbyteri aut Episcopi male agerent, ad Senatum Ecclesiasticum aut Synodum referebant, eamq; dignam videretur publico judicio damnabant, i. e. aut suspendebant, aut excommunicabant, aut removebant. Whitak. cont. 1. 2. 1. c. 2. se. 16.

^a *Marth. 18.*

^a *1 Cor. 2. 6.*

^b *Annot. in
Cyp. Epist. 65.*

^c *Epist. 65.
al. 3. Ep. 90.*

^d *Episc. by div.
right. p. 106.*

^e *Pag. 136.*

Pag. 107.

Offenders though private persons, ^a *Dic Ecclesia*, Tell the Church; and the sentence of Excommunication pronounced and executed on the incestuous person at Corinth; It was not the act of a Bishop alone or of his Officiall or Chancellour (these are Apocryphall names and offices, unknowne for some Centuries of yeares in the Church of Christ) but it was ^a *ἐκκλησία τοῦ κυρίου ἐπέταξε τὴν ἐκκλήσιον* a Punishment inflicted by many. 2. I may adde the answer of *Gonsartius* unto *Pamelius* objecting this place of the Apostle to *Timothy* for the prooffe of Episcopall Preeminence over Presbyters. ^b *An accusatio* on is two wayes received either privately or in the Ecclesiasticall assembly which doth judge of those crimes. This though it be taken as spoken to *Timothy* alone, yet implieth, as he there shewes only a preheminance of Order in *Timothy* nor of power and authority. Which he thus makes good; if a Bishop were accused the Presbyters did receive the accusation and judge of it; as he proves out of *Cyprian*, who ^c writes to *Epictetus* and the people of *Assura* commanding them not to admit to the Episcopacie againe *Fortunatianus* who sometimes was their Bishop, but had denyed the faith of Christ. Other Bishops, saith *Gonsartius*, are not called together, nor is there any appeale to the Bishop of Rome, but the *Assurinan* Church in a convenient order judgeth their own Bishop. In the Presbyterie one of the Presbyters or Ministers of the Church did sit, for orders sake onely, untill those degrees did arise of which we have elsewhere spoken. Therefore to receive an accusation against one is not only a note of preheminance, but of order also, and that preheminance doth not confirme those degrees which afterwards introduced tyranny into the Church, but manifesteth an eunomie in the house of God. This shall suffice to be spoken touching that branch of Episcopall Jurisdiction; I come to another, and that concerns the Commission given to *Timothy* concerning the Doctrine of the Teachers.

^d *Timothy* is charged to charge the Preachers of Ephesus, that they teach no other doctrine, that they doe not give heed to Fables and Genealogies, and ^e *Titus* is commanded *ἐμπεῖραι* to stop the mouths of those false teachers, who broach doctrines they ought not for filthy lucre sake, and to passe sharp censures upon them, what can doe this but Episcopall authority, saith the Bishop; I may truly say (saith he) that both *S^t. Paul* and *Timothy* his Disciple doe

as truly Lord it here in their Episcopall power; as those Bishops which they (the Scots) have abdicat

I will not here *Chamizim* take into the snke of the Lordly tyrannicall exorbitancies of our late Prelates; they stinke bad enough already. I will not cause the Reader to stop his nose at those putrid steemes which would arise if that puddle were stirred. Onely I would desire the Reader by the way to consider that St Paul hath professedly disclaimed all lording it over (the consciences of the Corinthians: *Not that we have dominion over your faith*, saith he, *but are helpers of your joy; for by faith ye stand.* *Cajetan* hath well observed that this is here added by the Apostle to exclude a calummie, which might have been cast on him, because the words of Paul which he spake immediately before; *via re share you*, might seeme to imply some dominion; he presently subjoyne this, *Not that we have dominion over your faith*, which words are fully and fully paraphrased by *Beza thus*, *Not as if I might doe any thing amongst you in matter of Religion, what I pleased by my power in binding and loosing of your consciences; but I am the Minister of God to comfort you and in choise of your hearts; we are helpers of your joy wherein he doth secretly oppose the joy and peace of Conscience, whereof he makes God the author but himselfe and his colleagues the Ministers, unto that tyrannicall perour which is caused by those who carry themselves as if they were Lords over the consciences of both Ministers and people.* *Stog A* *ed* *to* *instruo*

1 Cor. i. 14.

In locum.

In eund. locum.

We doe not say that either Timothy or Titus were mere Deputies, and so comperees or Equals to the Presbyters of Ephesus or Crete, nor were they Bishops such as you fancy them, and in that superiority of degree above them; but Evangelists of an higher Orbe then either Bishops, for which you plead, or Presbyters. Look on them in that degree wherein they were, and they might on better grounds, with more authority charge false teachers, that they should not *etresidumaper* teach any other doctrine then what the Apostles had taught; (for unto that the Apostle himselfe doth limit it, doubling his *Anathema* on the heads of them whosoever they were that should doe it) then any ordinary Bishop whatsoever, if there had been then any such distinct from Presbyters. The case is cleare concerning them both, they had been the Apostles companions in his trauales, had been fully instructed in the doctrine which

Gal. i. 8.

- be preached, and in respect of their familiar conversing with him, they could avouch what truth he had delivered. This of *Paul* to *Timothy*, the pretended Bishop of Ephesus is clear for him. *Thou hast fully known my doctrine, manner of life, &c.* *Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them.* As for *Titus* touching whom Bishop *Hall* is pleased to tell us, there is no colour to say he was an Evangelist, nor to insist on the frequent use which the Apostle made of him, in sending him from one Church to another, consider what false teachers they are whose mouths the Apostle would have in an especial manner to be stopped, they are those of the Circumcision. Their *glorie* could more effectually convince and confound with greater authority then any other man whatsoever. For he could in respect of his own person declare what privilege *S^t Paul* pleaded for, to wit exemption from the yoke of Circumcision. *Titus was not circumcised by reason of false brethren, who crept in unwilling to give out our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us again into bondage;* this was done by the interposition of Apostolike authority, when others would have urged it. Yet more then this, when *Paul* himselfe with the chosen Elders from the Churches of Antioch went by revelation to conferre with the Apostles Elders and brethren concerning that vexatious question moved by some false teachers, who pretended the consent of the Apostles with them, in that which they obtruded on the Gentiles, the necessity of Circumcision, *Titus* was one of those who went up with the Apostle *Paul* to the Apostles at Jerusalem; him and *Barnabas* did *S^t Paul* take along with him, to be witnesses to his firste the Apostles of his doctrine preached among the Gentiles, and also to the Churches of his action with the Apostles, and their concurrence with him giving him the right hand of fellowship. Now consider, I pray you, what was one speciall privilege of the Apostles, those whom our Saviour himselfe made choise of, to whom he did renew and enlarge his commission after his Resurrection; and you shall finde that *Titus* was a sharer in a privilege next removed unto it, but one degree below them. They were eye and care-witnesses of the doctrine, miracles, sufferings and Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, as is cleare from that speech at *Peter* (at the election of *Matthias* in the roome of *Judas*) and what

2 Tim. 3. 10.

1 Th. ver. 14.

2 Pag. 117.

2 Tit. 1. 10.

2 Gal. 2.

2 Gal. 2. 1.

2 Par. 13. 14.
in Ep. ad Gal.

2 Act. 1. 23, 22.

what elsewhere he writeth to the diſperſed Jewes, *I was an eye-witneſſes of his Maieſty; and ſhis voice was heard.* The priviledge of an Evangelist was this; theſe things concerning Chriſt were delivered unto them by thoſe which from the beginning were eye-witneſſes, and miniſters of the Word. As the Apoſtles were Chriſts Attendants, and continued with him in all his ſempations, ſo the Evangelists were *Apoſtolorum comites*, the Apoſtles companions in all their travails and peregrinations, fellow-workers and helpers in the Miniſtery. *Titus* then being an eye-witneſſe and an ear-witneſſe not only of S^r Pauls preaching among the Gentiles, but of the Apoſtles determination and conſultation in their Synodical decree touching Circumciſion, might with ſarre more authoritie ſtop the mouths of theſe falſe teachers of the Circumciſion, then any ordinary Biſhop or Paſtor whatſoever. By this time, I hope, it is evident that the charge given to *Timothy* and *Titus* makes nothing for Episcopall authoritie and Jurisdiction. There is no neceſſitie to limit and reſtrain that phraſe of the Apoſtles, *uiusmodi moniti* muſt be ſtopped to an authoritative and iudicarie ſilencing of a falſe teacher, *Cajetan* extends it unto a Doctrinall as well as a Definitive ſilencing by a ſentence againſt him. *Piſcator* hath obſerved that *enſequeſſa* is the ſame with *opus*, which latter word is uſed ſometimes to expreſſe ſuch a ſtopping of the mouth and ſilencing as is the fruit of a doctrinall conviction; and confutation by evidence of Scripture. So the Evangelist S^r *Matthew* uſeth it, *When the Pharisees had heard that he (Chriſt) had put the Sadducees to ſilence*, which was done not by any definitive ſentence pronounced in a iudiciary manner againſt them, authoritatively commanding them to hold their peace and preach ſuch falſe doctrine no more, but by teſtimonie of Scripture was their error ſo fully diſcovered that they had not a word to reply for themſelves in maintainance of their erroneous opinions. *To erre, becauſe ye know not the Scriptures, nor the power of God. Have ye not read what God ſaid unto Moſes in the buſh, &c.* Of this kind of ſilencing or ſtopping the mouth the Apoſtle ſpeakes in this place, as is evident by what goes before and what followes. Amongſt the qualifications of a Biſhop, i.e. a Preſbyter, as you ſhall ſee anon, this is one, he muſt hold faſt the faithfull word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by ſound doctrine both to exhort, and ſo convince the gainſayers.

[2 Pet. 1. 12, 13.]

[Luke 1. 2.]

[Chap. 12. 18.]

[Tit. 1.]

* *Auſeritatem
or doctrina,
Cajet. in loc.
Schol. in loc.*

* *Matt 22. 34.
iſtius.*

[ibid.]

[Tit. 1. 5.]

^a Ven. 10, 11.

^b Ver. 13.

^c 1 Tim. 3, 16.

d Act. 18. last.
 εν τω ονοματι
 κυ ημες κειτο.

^e Pag. 108.

f Differ. betw.
 Christ. subject.
 and unchrist.
 rebel. p. 224.
 part. 2.

Why is this required, the words following shew the reason, ^a For there are many unruly and vain talkers, and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision whose mouths must be stopped. This stopping of the mouth here spoken of must be by a Conviction from sound doctrine. Then consider what follows immediately, ^b This minis^tre is true, whereof we reprove them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith. You see still the silencing is by a conviction, and a doctrinall confutation, so is the noun used when the Apostle saith of the Scripture, it is profitable, ^c εν τω κειναι for conviction or confutation, so the compound of the Verbe, in that phrase of the Evangelist concerning Apollos, ^d he mightily convinced the Jewes, to wit, by the clear evidence of Scripture which could not be gain-said or shifted off by any sophistical evasions whatsoever. But where the word εν τω κειναι is used to signifie the passing of sharp censures, I shall not be ashamed to confesse my ignorance, but am willing to be informed by my betters, Bishop Hall or any of his brethren. Seeing the Apostle here speaks of a doctrinall silencing and confutation, I hope this is not a priviledge fastned to an Episcopall chaite, but such as is communicable to a Presbyter.

Thus much shall suffice to be spoken concerning these charges given to Timothy and Titus, by which the Doctor hath undertaken to prove them to be invested with Episcopall power and Jurisdiction, but how well let others judge. There is one thing more in these pages which will deserve a like animadversion; it is a passage, which had it fallen from the pen of any other then Doctor Hall, I should have thought the man had certainly a Pope in his belly; it is this, ^e That House of God which is the Church (wherein Timothies behaviour is so required) is not some one private congregation; such an one were not fit for that stile the pillar and ground of truth, but the famous Diocesan Church of Ephesus. Me thinks the phrase here used, and stile of some other of late amongst us, comes somewhat neerer to that of the Jesuites mentioned by Doctor Bilson; ^f This is, saith he, the right trade of your apologie to pretend the Church, and meane the Pope. — And so you make the Church but a cloak-bag to carry the Popes titles after him. Our Cathedralists pretend the Church but meane the Bishops and themselves, and so the Church is made but a cloak-bag to carry the Diocesans titles of honour after him. But why, I pray you, may not a particular pri-

vate

vate congregation be stiled the pillar and ground of truth; There is no Orthodox Divine can be ignorant that the Church is said to be the pillar of truth, not as the notion of a pillar is taken by Architects in building, for that which doth uphold and beare up the rooffe, or loft that lyeth on it, as if the Church did give supportance and stabilitie to the truth, but as a pillar in the market-place, to which the Kings Proclamation is fastned, that all his subjects may take notice of it. Hath Christ fastned his truth to a Cathedrall only, that there it is to be found, and no where else? The sad experience of that ignorance, superstition, and profaneness which reigne in places neerer unto them hath verified the Proverbe, The neerer the Church the further from God. *Lyra* though a popish Fryar, and one that lived in times of much blindness, yet saw so much light that he could say, ^b *The Church consists not in men of dignity and power, either Ecclesiasticall or Secular; for many Princes and Popes with other inferior persons have revolted from the faith: wherefore the Church consists in those persons in whom is the true knowledge and confession of the faith.* I would we had not too much cause to confesse the same of many of our Church-men, Prelates and their adherents, the Cathedrall Diocesan crew, with others: but albeit there hath been an apostasie in them, yet blessed be the Lord for it, we may truly say of the Church of England at this day, what once a ^c Cathedralit spake in favour of the Church of Rome: *The errors have been the errors of the domineering faction in the Court of England; not the errors of the Church of England.* I hope they will give us leave to speake as favourably of our mother the Church of England, as they of theirs the Church of Rome, which is with them a true Church. I will shut up all that I shall say concerning *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the pretended Episcopall power committed unto them, the same as our Hierarchists say, with what they exercise, with the observation of a Friar, yet an ^d Historian of good esteeme, *It is denyed in words that Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction is dominion, as is the secular, yet one knoweth not how to put a difference between them.* But *S^t Paul* did, when he wrote to *Timothy*, and repeated it to *Titus*, that a Bishop should not be greedy of gaine, nor a striker. Now on the contrary, they make men pay for processe, and imprison the parties, as is done in the secular Courts.

In the next place, according to promise, I come to view the writings.

Non ratione architectonica, sed jorenica.

^a *Lyra* in *Marg.* c. 16.

ⁱ *D^r Potter* in his answer to *Charitie* mistaken.

^b *Historie* of the *Counc.* of *Trent.* lib. 4. p. 33.

tings of the Apostles, and to enquire whether in them there be any such Superiority and Distinction in Order and in Office between a Bishop and a Presbyter, as is pretended by our Prelates. If in this Scripture may be judge it is as cleare as the Sunne, in my apprehension; that a Bishop and a Presbyter are one and the same in Order and in Office. For when the Apostle doth set downe the sacred orders, we find no other but these, Bishops and Deacons, that which is by the Hierarchists made a middle order between both, to wit, of Presbyters is not at all expresse in distinction from the former, which doth evidently prove, that the distinction between a Bishop and a Presbyter is but an institution of man, not of God, nor hath it foundation in the Word of God. Consider the Inscription of *S^t Pauls* Epistle to the Philippians, it is directed to *Al the Saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons.* When *Paul* directeth *Timothy* how he should carry himself in the Church of God, that is saith a late *Patron* of Episcopacie, how he must carry himself as a *Diocesan*, in such a Church where there would be need of all varieties of Church-Officers, we have no other Orders set downe then the fore-mentioned, *a* Bishops and Deacons, together with the qualifications of the one and the other. I demand then of our Diocesans now how comes it to passe that the order of Presbyters is left out. If Presbyters were a distinct order from Bishops, and inferiour to them in place and power, would the Apostle have omitted them as unnecessary and superfluous in such a Church, as the Diocese of Ephesus, yea of Asia rather (for of that extent is the Church there mentioned by the Apostle said to be, by our fore-mentioned Bishop.) Come we from *Timothy* to *Titus*, and view the Epistle directed unto him; *He is left by the same Apostle at Crete, that he should set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every city.* Of what ranke and order these Presbyters or Elders were, the verses immediately following will informe us. The qualifications of those which should be admitted to this order, and be made Presbyters follow; *If any be blamelesse, the husband of one wife, having faithfull children, not accused of riot, or unruly.* Why must a Presbyter be such an one, the next verse gives the reason; *For a Bishop must be blamelesse as the steward of God, not self-willed, &c.* Therefore must a Presbyter be blamelesse, because he is Gods steward, a Bishop, an Overleer

1 Phil. 1. 1.

a Bishop Hall,
pag. 108. 09.

a 1 Tim. 3.

a Tit. 1. 5.

Verf. 6.

Verf. 7.

Overseer (as the Greeke word properly imports, and so it is rendred by our late Translators, *Act. 20.*) set over the House of God. In a word, if the Apostles had in their dayes instituted any such distinct order of Bishops above Presbyters, then surely either in their last and valedictory speeches to those Presbyters whom they ordained, and Churches which they planted, or in their Epistles sent unto them, we should have some expressions tending to this purpose, some charge or other given either to the Bishop how he should carry himselfe towards the Presbyters under his power and Jurisdiction, or to the Presbyters how they should behave themselves towards the Bishop set over them. But we finde not the least intimation of any such thing; nor of one Bishop set over many flocks and congregations, but rather of more Bishops then one, which had the oversight of a flock. The command given to the Hebrewes is this,

1 Heb. 13. 17

Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your soules, as they that must give an account.

He doth not say *ὑπακούετε*, Be obedient to the Bishop that is over you, but *τοῖς ἡγουμένοις*, in the plurall number, *them that have the rule over you, for they watch for your soules*; it is too great a burthen for one to be intrusted with the oversight, and give an account for the soules in many congregations. The counsell of St Paul

to the Thessalonians is thus: *We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and ὡς ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν κυρίου Κεῖν, which are over you in the Lord.*

However in the writings of the Fathers, as the Archbishop of Armagh hath observed, which were somewhat neerer the Apostles dayes, the title of *ἐπίσκοπος* (which is the same with the word here used by the Apostle) is limited unto one,

whom other of the Fathers doe peculiarly terme a Bishop (in what respect you shall heare more anon) yet, it is cleare by this place of the Apostle, that they confined not that Title unto one, nor did they set up one under that title or notion, Superiour to the rest of the Presbyters, who laboured also in the word and doctrine. In which regard *Βεζα* spake a truth, and no more but a truth, when he observed from this and other places that the Church was governed, a

Pastoribus in communi, by the Pastors in common, or by the common consent and counsell of the Pastours, the degree of *Episcopacie* being not as yet invented or found out by the Apostles or Apostolike men. Let us proceed, St Peter commandeth the Presbyters

1 1 Theſ. 5. 12

Orig. of Episcop.
pag. 5.

Amos in loc.

^a 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2.

^a Dissert. 1. de
presb. & episc.
cap. 6.
^a Ibid. cap. 3.
pag. 172.

^a Dist. 60. cap.
Nihil ex urb.
Papa. Sacros
ordines dicimus
diaconatum &
Presbyteratum.
Hos quidem so-
los ecclesia pri-
mitiva habu-
isse dicitur.

^a Sent. lib. 4. dist. 24. tit. 1. Excellentèr cano-
nes duos tantum sacros ordines appellari cen-
sent, diaconatum scilicet & presbyteratum, quia
horum solum Ecclesia primitiva legetur habuisse,
& de his solis præceptum Apostoli habemus.
¶ Dicunt quidem quod in ecclesia prima pri-
mitiva commune erat officium episcoporum & sa-
cerdotum, & nomina erant communia dist. 95.
cap. Olim, & officium erat commune: sed in se-
cunda primitiva ceperunt distinguere & nomi-
na & officia. Antè prælationem ergo ista nomi-
na Presbyter et Episcopus erant prorsus synony-
ma, & etiam administratio communis erat, quia
communi consilio sacerdotum regebantur eccle-
sie. In schismate ergo remedium (sui hic dicitur)
jacta est prælatio ut unus præesset & quoad
nomen, & quoad administrationem, & quoad
quædam sacramenta, que modo appropriantur
episcopis. Gloss. in dist. 95. cap. Legimus, verb.
Postea.

to ^a fixed the flock of God which is amongst them, *ἐκκομίζοντες* taking
the oversight of them (or being and performing the office of Bi-
shops amongst them) not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy
lucre, but of a ready mind. From which and other places it is clear;
that in Scripture phrase *ἐκκομίζοντες* is so farre from signifying an Or-
der distinct from, or superiour to a Presbyter, that it imports no o-
ther thing then the Office of a Presbyter; a truth which ^a Salmasi-
us hath proved at large against *Peravian* the Jesuite. Yea, the ^a same
learned Critick hath observed that there is as much colour of reason
to say that a Senatur and Counsellour were distinct Offices and
Orders, as to say that a Bishop and a Presbyter are different in Of-
fice and in Order. For as the Senate and the Counsell did not con-
stitute different bodies, but one and the same assembly was under-
stood by both denominations, so the particular members of that bo-
dy were sometimes called Senaturours, sometimes Counsellours. *Idem*
est, saith he, *de Presbyterio & Episcopio*. The Presbyterie and the
Episcopium were but one and the same body, and convention of Bi-
shops and Presbyters.

The light of Scripture is so evident and convincing (unto all those
which doe not shut their eyes against it, being prepossessed with
other fancies that from thence (to omit other testimonies of the
Fathers, with sundry Divines of note both Protestant and Popish):

^a *Gratian*, and ^a *Peter Lombard* have
confessed, that the Scripture mentioneth
no other sacred Orders then of Presbyters
and Deacons, the primitive Church is
said to have these onely, and we have the
precept of the Apostle concerning these
alone. As *Gratian* in his text of the Canon
Law, to *Yohannes Semeca* in his Glosse
thereon tells us, In the first Primitive
Church Bishops and Presbyters or Priests
were all one, both in name and office; the
names and offices began to be distinguish-
ed in the second primitive Church; when
for a remedy of schisme one was advanced
in the Church (which was before gover-
ned by the common consent of Presbyters).

in respect of name, and administration, and some sacraments, which are now appropriated to the Bishops. Thus Semer. If any shall desire to know of what extent this first primitive Church is, none can better inform him than learned Dr. Ussher, once Divinity Professor at Dublin, now Archbishop of Armagh, who having observed out of Hefesippus, that during the age of the Apostles the Church continued *under the same discipline, a pure and undefiled Virgin, and the venerable of Religion. We are not ashamed to appeal to this first Primitive Church* (for so it hath pleased some to distinguish) saith he, referring us in the margin to this fore-mentioned Gloss of Semer. And truly as in articles of faith and points of Doctrine, against all Romanists with other pretenders of antiquity, so in matters of discipline, and this particular point of controversy concerning the Parity, or rather Identity of Bishops and Presbyters against all Hierarchists whatsoever, we are neither afraid nor ashamed to appeal to this first Primitive Church, the Church in the Apostles dayes. Before I part with *Gratian* and the Canon Law, I shall adde this out of it, we finde there another Originall of this Imparity and distinction in Order between a Bishop and a Presbyter, *The difference that now is*

De succ. & statu Eccles. cap. 1. pag. 19.

between an Archbishop, a Bishop, and a Presbyter was introduced, saith Gratian, into the Church from the imitation of the Heathenish Hierarchie, who so marshal-

Horum discretio à Gentilibus maxime introducta est, qui suos Flamines, alios simpliciter Flamines, alios Archiflamines, alios Protos flamines appellabant. Grat. decr. par. 1. dist. 21. Vide plura distinct. 8c. Can. in illu.

led their Priests that some were Archiflamines, some Prataflamines, some Flamines. The same is acknowledged for the substance of it by the *Canons of Cologne* in their *Enchiridion of Christian Religion*. And were it needfull I could shew out of sundry *Divines* that this forme of Church Government was here erected at first in *England* in imitation of the Hea-

Vi Rom. veteris olim majores & minores Pontifices, & inter hos unum summum, qui omnes sacra prestant, habebant: ita & nos in Christianismo easdem denominationes servamus: Archiepiscopi dicti sunt tanquam primores Episcopi, &c. De sacr. Ord. p. 169. edit. Paris an. 1558.

thenish Hierarchie by *Lucius* the first Christian King that embraced the faith. Among those many and pregnant testimonies which might be produced in confirmation of this truth, against the Divine Institution of the Majority of Bishops above Presbyters, I shall trouble your patience but with one remarkable passage in the

Mat. Park. Antiq. Brit. p. 5. Paget in his Christianogr. and Fitzherbert the les.

d Historie of
the Councell
of Trent, lib 7.
p 619.

Councell of Trent. ^a When in the Congregation, Oct. 2. All the Spaniards with some others made a new instance that the Institution and Superiority of Bishops de Jure divino might be defined; unto the Legates chamber the next morning came three Patriarches, six Archbishops, and eleven Bishops, with a request that it might not be put into the Canon; that the Superiority is De Jure divino. And make I beseech you the reasons, for in themselves, but especially proceeding from the mouths of such and so many persons, they carry a great deal of weight with them; in regard that 1. It favoured of ambition. 2. It was unseemly themselves should give sentence in their own cause. 3. Because the greater part would not have it put in. And whatsoever shall peruse that history, and diligently observe the managing of this business in the Councell, shall finde that the opinion of the Spaniards, against which the fore-mentioned Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops did produce their reasons (which I doe not finde were ever answered or refused) was inferred into the Canon, merely on these two grounds 1. In opposition to the Lutherans, this was the reason given by the Archbishops of ^a Granata, in the Congregation held, Oct. 13, 1562, and of ^a Zara, as also by the ^b Bishop of Segovia in the following Congregations. 2. In favour of the Pope, for they were afraid that if the Divine institution and superiority of Bishops were denied, or the Prelates honour did decay, the Popes triple Crown would soon fall off his head. This made the Bishop of Segovia in plain termes confesse, ^c If the power of the Bishops be weakened, that of the Pope is weakened also; and when the Secretary of the Marquesse of Pescara dealt with the Archbishop of Granata for his stiffness in urging the divine Institution of Bishops, advising him not to touch any thing in prejudice to the holy See; Granata answered, ^d He never meant to say any thing against the Pope, but thought that whatsoever was spoken for the authority of Bishops, was for the benefit of his Holiness; being assured that if their authority were diminished, the Obedience to the holy See would decrease also, though by reason of his old age he knew it would not happen in his time. Thus much of the first argument taken from the testimonies of Scripture.

2. The writings of those which immediately succeeded the Apostles, and lived in the next age after them, shew that in their dayes
Bishops

e 1b p. 604.
d P. 606.
f P. 607.

g P. 607.

h 1b p. 619.

Bishops and Presbyters were all one in name and office, not one preferred above the other in Order and Superiority of power. *Polycratus* was as is confessed the Disciple of *S. John*, the Angel of the Church of *Smyrna*, saith Bishop *Hall*, following therein (as in most others) *Dr. Downham*: Now whether there were any such Order of Bishops superior to Presbyters in the Church of Christ in his dayes, let the world judge from his own words in his Epistle to the Philippians: I will not spend lines, much lesse leaves in the praise of the author, or his Epistle; I leave that to others who make good the poets saying,

Laudas venales cupiens extrudere merces. Mercator.

Nor will I insist on the Inscription of the Epistle, wherein he doth conjoyne with himselfe the Presbyters of the Church of *Smyrna*, though from thence ** Salmasius* doth prove that he was not a Bishop in that restrained sense wherein the word was used in after ages, for saith he, there is no example of an Epistle written by a Bishop; wherein, when once a Bishop came to be advanced above the Presbyters, he doth conjoyne them in his Inscription as his Companions and Equals: But take his plaine and positive command or counsell to the Philippians, how they must behave themselves. He requires them to be *subject to the Presbyters and Deacons as unto God and to Christ*: By which it is cleare there were then no other orders then these two, none above a Presbyter to which they must be in subjection: Here is not the least mention of a Bishop, as *† Espencans* doth acknowledge, though being prepossessed with some fancies of his owne, *de ordine Principante*, as he calls the order of Bishops, for which he doth contend, he wondreth why they are omitted. Let us proceed, and see what power and authority these Presbyters had in the Church of Philippi, This we shall learne from his Injunction unto them; for he commands them to provide things honest in the sight of God and men, abstaining from all anger, respect of persons and unjust judgement. He wils them farther to flee all covetousnesse, not suddenly giving credit to accusations against any one, nor be harsh in judgement. These passages I owe to *† Salmasius*, by which it is evident that these Presbyters of Philippi, to whom he gives this in charge, had then Ecclesiasticall Jurisdictionive power in their hands, and none was superior unto them therein in the Church of Philippi in those dayes.

† Epist. parr. 1. p. 156

† Dissert. de presb. & epis. cap. 4 p. 232

† Πολύκρῳτος ἀποστόλος ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός. Χρ. 154.

† Omissa nescio quamobrem Episcopis mentione Epist. digress. in 1 Tim. lib. 1. ca. 1. p. 133.

† Loc. cit. p. 235

• Archbishop
of Armagh,
Orig. of *Epist.*
p. 8. & 9.
• *Epist. ad*
Smyrna.

¶ *Li. 3. adu. her.*
cap. 3. & in
epist. ad Florin.

• Margin. annot.
in *epist. Ignat.*
ad Polyc.

† In *epist. ad*
Troas, τὴ δὲ
προσβύλευσιν,
ἀλλ' ἢ συνέλευσις
ἱερῶν. οὐ βούλει
τὴ συνέλευσιν
τὴ ἐκκλησίαν

Before I proceed I must remove one rubbe that is cast in the way by the ¶ Patrons of Episcopacie. It is this, *Polycarpe* was himselfe a Bishop of the Church of Smyrna, as is proved amongst other evidences by the testimony of *Ignatius*, who in his Epistle to the Church of Smyrna salutes him under that name, as a person distinct from the Presbytery, and exhorteth all the people to follow their Bishop as Christ Jesus did his Father, and the Presbytery as the Apostles, telling them, that no man ought either to administer the Sacraments, or doe any thing appertaining to the Church without the consent of the Bishop: and of ¶ *Irenaeus*, who so styles him, and witnesseth that he himselfe was present when *Polycarpe* himselfe did discourse of his conversation with St. *John*. From all which it is inferred that he was the Angel or President of the Church of Smyrna, when St. *John* wrote this his *Revelation*.

Yet all this makes nothing against what I have delivered, as I conceive under favour, and with submission to men of greater reading and better judgement. For in sundry passages in that Epistle of *Ignatius* to *Polycarpe*, as ¶ *Vedelinus* hath observed, supposititious, thrust into them by some one or other out of the pretended Constitutions of *Clement*, lib. 2. cap. 26. 2. Albeit *Ignatius* doth in that Epistle salute *Polycarpe* the Bishop, and the Presbyterie, yet it doth necessarily follow that he was a Bishop in order distinguished from the Presbytery, if he were a Presbyter President of the Presbytery it is a sufficient reason why in this salutation of *Ignatius* he should be named in the first place, and the Presbyterie after him: It appeares by *Ignatius* elsewhere that the Presbyters were Counsellors unto and Coassefours with the Bishop in the Presbyterie, for so he doth expressly call them: ¶ *What is the Presbyterie*, saith he, *but a sacred Assembly, the Counsellours and Coassefours of the Bishop*. In the Romane common-wealth though all the *Patricii* or Noblemen were Counsellours of State and Senatours, yet there were two chosen out from among the rest, who had for honours sake the denomination of Consuls appropriated unto them, yet this title of honour did not advance them to a Place or Dignitie of a different Order from or Superiour to the rest of the *Patricii*, they were all Counsellours, but these two the Presidents of the Council, and from this their Office they had their name of honour *Consules à consulendo*. How weak a ground, the restriction of the name Bishop un-

to him that is a President of the Presbyterie, to prove his distinction in order from thence, hath been shewed before out of * *Salmasius*, who hath made it evident that by the same reason, a Counsellour and Senatour; The Councell and the Senate should constitute different Orders, and Offices: yea, all that the Primate of Armagh (whom for his Pietie and Learning I shall ever honour) doth in plain termes plead for (at leastwise seemes unto me to plead for) and doth undertake to prove is only this, that he to whom the title of Bishop (which was as is confessed by Dr *Reynolds*, whom he alleadgeth at first common to all the Presbyters, by whose common counsell and advice all Church affaires were ordered) is restrained by the Fathers, was a President of the Presbyterie, which may easily be granted without any great advantage to the Hierarchists, or prejudice to the Presbyterians. But if by reason of Presidentship it shall be inferred that the Bishop was in Order and in Office distinct from and superior to the Presbyters; I shall for my part be ready to assent unto those which say so, on the same conditions that that Old Archbishop of Armagh profered to subscribe to the opinion of the Prelates and Doctors, (who were well-pleased with their assertions that did say there was by divine institution a difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter) So that the difference may be manifested out of the divine Oracles, and what is affirmed be proved by them.

3. True it is that *Irenaeus* doth indeed set forth *Polycarpe* under that name Bishop of the Church of Smyrna, yea and withall doth say that he was constituted Bishop of that Church by the Apostles; yet doth it not follow, that he was a Bishop in Order superiour to a Presbyter, which I shall prove two wayes: 1. By the writings of the Apostles (which best of all informe us what orders of Church Officers they did institute) a Bishop and Presbyter are one in Order and Office. Of this I have spoken before, and therefore will but mention it: onely I will adde the judgement of that fore-mentioned old and learned Archbishop of Armagh in this point; who considering the passages of the Apostle in his Epistle to *Timothie*, wherein there is mention of no other Or-

* *Dissert. de presb. & episc.*
pag. 232.

r. *Fœderis Armachanus diverſam ſententiam eſſe magis amicis Doctores eccleſie, cui paratum ſe proſeque morum gerere, modo ex divinis differentiis oftendatur oraculis. Mich. de Pal. in 4. diſt. 24. diſp. 2. Num episc. ſit ordo.*

u. Constat quod inter ordinem Episcopalem, & inter ordinem Diaconatus non est ordo medius, quoniam si quis esset, non dubium, quia iste Doctor maximus, qui suum euangelium recepit à Christo, ut ipse scribit ad Gal. 1. suum dilectum discipulum Timotheum de isto ordine instruxisset, & ei regulas dedisset, sicut de superiori & inferiori regulas dedit. Rich. Armach. lib. 1. l. quest. Armen. cap. 5. fol. 84.

* Hec dogmata tibi, qui ante nos fuerunt presbyteri qui & Apostolorum discipuli existerunt, non tradiderunt. - Possum coram deoustificari beatum illum & Apostolicum Presbyterum, si tale quid audisset rectorum. Irenaeus epist. ad Florin. Cent. Magd. ent. 2. cap. 10. col. 134. 135.

• In Epist. ad viii or.

z Iren. lib. 3. adu. her. cap. 7. compared with ts. 2. ejus lib. and li. 4. cap. 43. compared with cap 44 & 45.

y Iren. lib. 4. cap. 43.

z De rep. Eccl. l. 2. c. 3. n. 44.

• Ibid. n. 42.

• Pausan. tom. 2. l. 10. de Oec. Pont. c. 6. in fine.

ders but Bishops and Deacons, delivereth it as a * manifest and unquestionable truth that there is no middle order between them; for if there were, out of all doubt that great Doctor, who received his Gospel from Jesus Christ, would have instructed Timothy therein, and prescribed rules concerning that; as he did concerning the order above and below it. v. Our ot Irenaeus himselfe, who * elsewhere calls both Polycarpe himself, and other bishops of Asia Disciples of the Apostles Apostolicall Presbyters. Under the same notion doth he mention Anicetus, Pius Hyginus, & others called Bishops of Rome) giving them no other title then this, * The Presbyters that were before you: Whosoever shall peruse sundry passages in * Irenaeus will clearly see that in him the Succession of Bishops is all one with the succession of Presbyters. I will

mention but one and referre the Reader to the rest in the margin (if he thinke fit to consult the authour himselfe) * We must obey, saith he, those Presbyters which are in the Church, those which have a succession from the Apostles, as we have shewed. Who together with the succession of the Bishoprick or Episcopacie, have received the gift of truth according to the good pleasure of the Father. The places are so cleare, the words so plaine and evident that from thence Spalatensis did rightly inferre, * In all Presbyters Irenaeus doth both acknowledge and confound one and the same order of Episcopacie, though afterwards seeking to avoide the pregnant testimonies, which overthrow his position, and the position of other Hierarchists, he gives this childish and slender answer, or rather silyly evasion, that * He calls those which were true Bishops by the name of Presbyters, which how weake it is, let any man of understanding judge. Wherefore untill I be convinced by clearer evidence (to which I shall be ready to yeeld, if any be produced) I shall say with Chamier, ^b Ausim asserere, I dare be bold to main-

sent to be gone whither soever you will, and will doe those things which are commanded me by the people: Only let the flock of Christ live in peace with the Presbyters that are set over it: whosoever shall doe this shall purchase to himselfe exceeding great glory in the Lord, and every place will readily receive him. Thus that holy, that Apostolicall man Clemens, whose counsell if it might have found entertainment in the hearts of our Prelates and their adherents, neither Scotland of late yeeres, nor England at this day had met with such commotions and distractions. Or if examples, and the Presidents of those Fathers (in whom because they were Bishops, our late Hierarchists do glory as being their Predecessours) are likely to be more effectually with those which would be accounted their posteritie, I could put them in minde of *Gregorie Nazanz*, who was content to lay down his Episcopall honour, and to descend from that throne which he knew not well whether he might more properly call an hierarchicall or tyrannicall throne; nor did he feare to commit any sacriledge against that holy order, or contract on himselfe the guilt of that crime, but finding the Church wasted by contentions, States and Kingdomes exceedingly shaken, and like to be overturned by warres about that same *τὸ πρῶτον καὶ νέον ὄνομα*, that great and new name, as he calls the Episcopall dignitie, he willingly did it, induced thereunto by a most prevailing argument. He was assured of this, God would not dis-throne him in Heaven, though he lost his throne on earth. If the example of one induced thereunto by the hope of heaven be not sufficient, I could propose to our Prelates for a President the practise of *Austin*, and almost three hundred African Bishops, whose hearts were so inflamed with a desire of union and peace in the Church, that they were ready for the procuring of it to lay downe their Bishopricks, which in so doing they did not account to be lost, but more safely recommended unto God. And whereas amongst them all there were but two found to whom this motion was displeasing, the brotherly exhortation and reproofe generally of all the rest, did make them change their mindes and consent to doe, what the rest of their brethren did. The exhortation is very ponderous, and full of moving arguments. Give leave, O ye Fathers of the Church, unto a poore Presbyter to represent before you, what once your Predecessours spake unto them, who were loath to part with their dignities for

the

e Bishop Hall,
p. 62. It is our
glory & com-
fort we have
had such Pre-
decessours,

d Orat. 28 &
Carm. de div.
vita gen. al
pseudoepis.
e Quum certum
fit à Deo non
excludi quibus
thronum eripia-
tur. Cent. Mag.
Cent. 4. c. 10 col.
525. edit. Bas.
2624.
f Lib. de gest.
cum Emer. Don-
epis. tom. 7. col.
6. 7, 638. edit.
Bas. an. 1542.

the Churches benefit. They propose in the first place that of our Saviour, *Who so humbleth himselfe shall be exalted*; and from thence inferre, *Why should we doubt to offer to our Redeemer the sacrifice of this humilitie*? Hath he descended from Heaven into humane members that we might become his members, and are we afraid to descend from our seats that his very members be not torne in pieces by cruell division? There is nothing more sufficient for us then that we be faithfull and obedient Christians. This we are still. But we are made Bishops for the Christian people, therefore let us doe that with our Episcopall honour, which may conduce to the Christians peace of Christian people. If we be profitable servants why doe we envie the eternall gain of our master for our temporall preferment? Our Episcopall dignity will be more fruitfull unto us, if being laid down, it may rather collect, then being retained scatter the flock of Christ. Austin the Bishop said, *My brethren, if we have the Lord in our thoughts, this higher place is the watch-tower of the vine-dresser, not the top of honour for him that is proud. If whilst I retain my Bishoprick I scatter the flock of Christ, how is the dammage of the flock the honour of the Shepheard? With what face shall we in the world to come hope for the honour promised by Christ, if our honour in this world doth hinder Christian unity*? Thus saith the African Bishops.---*Sed Cynthius aurem.* I returne unto, and proceede in the proving of our Proposition laid downe before.

3. In Christian Churches which were of Apostolicall foundation, and others after them, we finde two Bishops in a Church or Citie, both in, and after the Apostles dayes; not one advanced before the other. Which being duly considered we may invert that argument which is used by our Hierarchists for the maintainance of their Episcopall Monarchie. You know, who hath laid down this amongst his *Postulata*: *We may not entertain so irreverent an opinion of the Saints and Fathers of the Primitive Church, that they who were the immediate successors of the Apostles would, or durst set up a forme of government different from that which was fore-designed unto them.* Let this be granted, the position may easily be retorted on their own heads thus, If the Apostles had instituted one Bishop onely in a Church, and placed him in superiority of power and order above the Presbyters, can we think that the Saints

and Fathers of the Primitive Churches, or the Churches themselves, would have so soon swerved from the rule and practice of their first founders, and have set up or admitted two Bishops where the Apostles had ordained but one. The truth of this assertion touching the Plurality of Bishops in a Church may be easily proved by variety of examples. [†] *Gerſon Bucerus* hath proved it by no lesse then ten examples out of Scriptures, and others out of Ecclesiasticall history. I will onely mention some few. *Narcissus* and *Alexander* both Bishops of Hierusalem, not by succession one after the other, but both at the same time, as is proved out of [†] *Eusebius*. *Ignatius* and *Eudodius* both Bishops of Antioch at the same time, the one ordained by *Peter*, the other by *Paul*, as the fore-mentioned [†] *ſorraine* Divine hath proved by the confession of *Clement*, *Conſtit.* l. 7. c. 46. and *Baronius*, tom. 1. ad an. 45. At Rome *Linus* and *Clerus*, or *Anacleus* were *Coeſcicopi* Fellows Bishops in *Peters* dayes, and afterwards as *Platina* [†] hath acknowledged, and before him *Ruffinus*, in *praefat. ad lib. Recognit.* as ^m *Chamier* hath observed out of him, and the ⁿ Centurists of Magdenburge after them both, *Libertinus* after his returne from exile was conjoynd with *Felix* in the Episcopall See at Rome, by the decree of the Synod of Symmian, as I have learned from ^o *Illyricus* and *Conſtantine* out of *Sozomen*: which Synod was held no lesse then fiftie six yeeres after the Council of Nice, which first made a Canonick constitution to the contrary, prohibiting that there should be two Bishops in one citie: as *Ruffinus* hath set down that Canon: yea, later then this *Austin* was made Bishop of Hippo in the dayes of *Valerius* and joyned with him as his Colleague in the Episcopall honour and Function,

^b *Dissert. de
gub. Eccles. p.
302, 303*

¹ *Ecclesiast. li. 6.
cap. 6. 10.*

² *Gerſ. Buc. p.
439.*

¹ *In vita Sancti
Petri.*

² *Paul. tom. 2.*

³ *l. 12. c. 4.*

⁴ *Cent. 1. part. 2.*

⁵ *c. 10. in Lino.*

⁶ *Car. rest. ver.*

⁷ *l. 1. col. 255.*

⁸ *Lib. 4. c. 14.*

⁹ *Lib. 1. c. 6.*

^e *Dum id fieri solere ab omnibus suaderetur, atq. id ignaro transmarinis et Africanis Ecclesie exemplis probaretur, compulsi sunt cum concilio suacubuit, et Episcopatum suum et majori honori ordinationem suscepit. Possid in vita Aug. c. 8. Quod quidem quia tanta ejus charitate, tan- reg. populi studio dominum id velle credidi, nonnulli jam exemplis praecedentibus quibus mibi omnia excusatio claudatur, vehementer summi excusare. Aug. apoc. ad Paulin.*

albeit *Austin* was very unwilling, yet the ¹ *Primate of Numidia Megastus Calamensis*, and *Valerius* together with all the rest Bishops that were present perswaded him therunto, and by variety of examples in the African and transmarine Churches proved it to be a thing so usuall, that *Austin* was left without all excuse, and yeelded to undertake *coepiscopatus* *ſarcenium*, as he calls it, the burthen of *Coeſcicopacie* with *Valerius*: for the prohibition by the Nicene canon was not yet come to

the knowledge of *Valerius*, nor to the ears of *Austin*, as he doth

elsewhere profess. This is a truth so clear, and which hath such varietie of instances for the confirmation of it, that the *Arch-bishop of Spalato* doth confesse, *The ancient holy Bishops made no scruple of making one of their Presbyters their companions, who both in Jurisdiction and Order, and full use of power properly Episcopall should be their Collegue and Fellow-bishop in the same Church.* Yea, *Occiam* proving out of the Canon Law it selfe that there may be two Bishops in a Bishoprick or Diocesse, doth thence inferre that by the same reason there may be also two Popes, as the government of one and the same Church by more Bishops then one conduceth to the benefit thereof, so the regiment of the Church Catholike by many Popes. * This he maintaines might be done in both, without any rent or division

in the Church, without the breach of that unity which the Apostle doth require, for among all those things which he reckons up as grounds of union, and motives to the conservation of it, *One faith, one Baptisme, &c.* *Unum Apostolicum* minime ponit, saith he, the Apostle makes no mention of one Apostolicall either Pope or Prelate. In a word; the practise of governing a Church by more Bishops then one was for a while so common and usuall (though by degrees it did begin in some places sooner to grow out of use then others) that if *Epiphanius* his observation be right, it was anciently proper to Alexandria alone to have one Bishop, whereas other Churches and Cities had two. His words are cleare and expresse for it; * *For Alexandria had not anciently two Bishops as other cities had.* This testimonie of *Epiphanius* concerning Alexandria I first lighted upon in *Danaus*; and since I met with it in him, I have oft times wordred, that in all the quotations out of the Fathers for Episcopacie, our Hierarchists take no notice of it. From the same *Danaus* I have learned one thing more touching the forementioned

Ep. 110. Quod consilio Niceno prohiberetur, ut esse ne sciebant, nec ipse sciebat.

* *Diei sunt tanta vulgus prisca illi Episcopi locum sibi Antequam episcopatu aliquem, ex suorum Ecclesiarum Presbyteria, qui et ipse tum jurisdictione et ordine, in quo pleno Episcopatu propriæ potestatis cum etiam nomine in eadem Ecclesia simul esset, et dicebatur Episcopus de* *ecp. Eccl. 1. c. 9. m. 14.*

* *Idem est iuris in parte quod in toto, et in parte quod in magnis, sed in eodem episcopatu possunt simul esse duo episcopi, Caus. 7. q. 1. c. Non est autem et c. Peris. et c. Quia vero: Ergo consimiliter propter necessitatem vel utilitatem possent esse simul plures summi Pontifices dicitur part. 3. tract. 1. lib. 2. c. 25. fol. 202.*

* *Fideles propter necessitatem vel utilitatem sufficienter movendum constituendo plures Pontifices non facerent conditionem Ecclesie deteriores, sed meliores eam. cap. 26. fol. 203. ad septimum*

* *Loc. cit. cap. 15. paulo ante finem.*

* *Ephes. 4.*

* *Her. 68. de Milit. i. 3. p. 1. dicitur quod in Alexandria duo erant Pontifices in Aug. de ber. ber. Arian.*

2 *ibid.*

Citie, where the Episcopall Monarchie first had footing, to wit, that out of the same Church proceeded the Monastick life, and divers other things which were the bane of the Church. Perhaps in this regard our Prelates are ashamed of this their originall, and would therefore faine bewitch the mindes of men with an opinion of another descent from Christs institution and his Apostles. Dealing herein as wisely for themselves, as the old Romans did, who being ashamed of the spurious and incestuous birth of their first Founder *Romulus*, pretended a Divine pedigree from *Mars* in a wood. But for my part I love them both so well, that I shall desire, that as Bishops and Monks did rise so they may fall, as they did come so they may go together, and the Christian world be rid at once of them both, which have proved *Ecclesia pestes* the bane of the Church.

Before I passe from this, one thing I must crave leave to adde, it concerneth the Succession of Bishops, which the Historians that did set it down, so mention, as if there were but one in a Church at once: yet this doth nothing contradict what hath beene spoken touching their plurality *Simul* at one and the same time in the same Church. For 1. Divers of those Historians, in their expressions and narrations had reference to the custome of those times in which themselves lived. For as much as in their dayes the custome of governing by many was changed into a government by one, and the name common at first to all, limited and restrained unto one, hence they speake but of one, though indeed (as hath been shewed) there were at the same time more Bishops then one in a Citie. 2. When there were two or more equall in name and Office, he that was the Survivor is reckoned as the Successor, whereas indeed he was not Successor properly, but onely a Colleague living longer then his fellow-

• *Exercit. 8. in Ignat. epist. ad Marian. cap. 3. num. 6. Constat Linum & Clavianum & Clementem obisse, quibus defunctis solum Clemens superstes, solum etiam Episcopi nomen retinuit, non quis inter adjuvatores Apostolorum solum ressedebat, &c.*

bishop. Thus doth *Vedelius* reconcile the difference which is between Historians concerning those three Bishops of Rome, *Linus*, *Cletus* and *Clement*, shewing that the name of Bishop was given to the last of these who was the survivor in that

Church, where through the whole Chapter he discovereth the vanity of those answers which are given by *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, and others. Left our Hierarchicall Monarchie should thinke to elude this and blow it away as the fancie of a Disciplinarian of the Ge-

new cut, I will back it with the suffrage of *Azonius de Dominis* the Archbishop of Spalato, whom for his pains in patronizing the Episcopall cause they cannot but respect. *Quoniam ex his tribus Collegis*, saith he, *because of these three that were Colleagues* Linus died first, Cletus next, and last of all Clemens, and each of them governed that Church with full authority, hence it came to pass that some of the ancients reckoned Linus the first Bishop of Rome, Cletus or Anacletus the second, and Clemens the third, as if they had been differenced in time one from the other, and one succeeded the other, when as indeed there was no proper succession at all.

4. As most Churches had more then one Bishop, so some for divers yeeres together long after the Apostles dayes had none at all, but were instructed in the faith by Presbyters alone without a Bishop over them. The Scottish Pacificator in his *Irenicum* hath observed out of *Johannes Maior* that the Primitive Church of Scotland flourished in the faith two hundred and thirty yeeres at least without any government by Bishops; being instructed in the faith and governed only by Priests and Monks. The same is recorded before them both concerning that Church by *Johannes Fordanus*, who adds that the Presbyters did governe the Church, *vixum sequentes Ecclesie primitiva*, following the custome of the primitive Church. Adde unto this one thing more which is remarkable; The Fathers in the second Council of Carthage, which was held, *an. 428*, did observe that *untill that time some places never had any Bishops at all, and thereupon they did ordain, ut tales in posterum non haberent, that such places as had none before, should not have any for future time*. From which Canonick Constitution I may with *Gersem Bucerus* argue thus, If those Fathers had conceived that the government by Bishops was appointed by the Lord Christ, on his Apostles, they could not, they would not by an Ecclesiasticall Canon have established, or permitted to the Churches the violation of Christs Institution, or the Ordinance of his Apostles.

5. When after the Apostles dayes the distinction between a Bishop and a Presbyter began, yet that difference which was then put was no advancement to a distinct order, but onely to an higher degree in the same order, nor did it bring along with it any superiority in power or Jurisdiction over and above the Presbyters. The truth of this position may be easily made manifest, and confirmed by these particulars.

*De rep. Eccl.
l. 2. c. 3. n. 63.*

*e Forbes. Iren.
lib. 2. cap. 11.
p. 119.
1 Joh. Mal. li. 2.
de gest. Scot. c. 2.*

*Scoticron.
li. 5. ca. 8. ap.
Jacob. Armach.
de pri. Eccl.
Brit. p. 300.*

*Concil. Carth.
2. can. 5.*

*Diff. de gov.
Eccles. p. 307.*

The name of Bishop (which together with the office was common to all the Presbyters) was now limited and appropriated unto him that was the eldest Presbyter. The name being thus limited, there was a priority granted him, to whom in respect of age and yeeres, in respect of his longer standing in the Presbyteriall calling, and consequently in regard of wisdom, gravity, experience, or endowments, reverence was due from his Colleagues, being his Juniors, and in that regard after a sort Inferiours. That of Ambrose,

^h in 1 Tim. 5. 3.

ⁱ Paul. 1. 10. 2.

^h de Oec. Pont.

^e 5. 8. nihil aliud quam inter

Presbyteros id

quod plures annos

in eo munere

Presbyteriali

ministrasset,

^h ibid.

^l Sum. contr.

tract. 2. 2. 22.

^h In Episcopis est quod inter Presbyteros primus. He is the Bishop who is the first among the Presbyters is a cleare testimonie, confirming what hath been delivered. For it doth declare manifestly, as ⁱ Chamier hath well observed, what was the degree of a Bishop in the first and purest times of the Church, that it was no more then this. He was accounted the Bishop, who among the Presbyters had ministered longest in the office of a Presbyter. Hence the forenamed French Divine doth conclude, ^h that at first there was no other difference between a Bishop and the Presbyters, then what is between the Deans and Canons in a Cathedral. In reference to this, ^l Ruvius doth conceive that ^l Tertullian speaks, when he saith, Presbyteri probantur quod Seniores; Approved Elders doe sit as Presidents, who have obtained that honour not by price but by estimation. In testimonie of that reverence and respect which age and Senioritie in the Ministry did bespeake at the hands of his fellow Presbyters, was the ^l ~~apostolical~~ chief seat in the Ecclesiasticall Senate assigned unto him, to whom the name of Bishop began now to be restrained on the fore-mentioned grounds. Like as in the more publick conventions of Bishops and Presbyters assembled in a Councell, the chiefest seat was deputed for him that was the most eminent and most venerable. On this ground ^l Eusebius reports, saith ^l Hieron, when the Bishops of Pontus met together, Firmus was made President, because he was antiquissimus & maxime venerabilis; the Eldest and most reverend amongst them. Hence ^h Chrysostome doth compare the Preeminence of the Bishops over the Presbyters to the Preeminence of the Eldest brother or first-born over his younger brethren, who hath indeed a certain preeminence over them, but it is a brotherly preeminence, not a Lordly or Jurisdictionall pretension, as ^l Spalatenus doth expresse it, the rest of his brethren being by ordinary right his equals in all things, excepting

^h Hist. 1. 5. c. 32.

^h Rom. 7. in

Act. Apost.

^o Fraternalm

quidem non de-

spoticam neq.

jurisdictiona-

tem Spal. de

reapoccl. 1. 1.

ca. 5. 13.

erping age, and that honour which is due to him in respect of it, the pre-eminence of primogeniture, which doth put in trust him with any commanding power over them, or put them in subjection unto him. The name of Bishop being thus limited to him that was the Elder Presbyter occasioned the mention of one alone in the writings of those who set downe the succession of Bishops. Learned *Salmasius* hath illustrated this by two examples. When Athens was governed by nine *Archontes* or Rulers, the first of them onely gave the name to the yeere, whence he was stiled *Archontes*. The Romane Emperours did oftentimes make many Consuls in a yeere, which were called *Consules per successionem*, yet these though they had full Consular authority were not esteemed among the Consuls, but onely those which were created in the beginning of the yeere, because they were the Eldest, the first Consuls.

That Primacy which was grained unto him which was the first and eldest Presbyter, and was now peculiarly called the Bishop, was only at first a Primacy of order, no Superiority of power, or Jurisdictional dominion, that Church affairs should be ordered by him alone without the consent and counsell of the Presbyters. Obser-

vable to this purpose is that expression of *Pius* bishop of Rome in his second Epistle to *Iustus* bishop of Vienna, *¶ Let the Presbyters and Deacons observe you, not as one governing, but as the Ministers of Christ*, in which, you see, he doth in plain termes deny that *Iustus* the bishop was greater in point of power and authority then the Presbyters and Deacons. You know, Reverend and Be-

loved, what was the resolution of *Cyprian* Bishop of Carthage, from the first entrance to his Episcopacy he determined to do nothing in the managing of Church affaires of his own head without the counsell of the Presbyters, without the consent of the people, which he lies down as a reason why he alone could not return an answer to that wherein *Donatus* and the rest of the Compresbyters did consult him. Nor did *Cyprian* entertaine this resolution, and observe it in his practice meerly out of a voluntary humility and condescension, as *Bellarmin* would beare the world in hand, and by this shift elude this pregnant testimonie; but he acknowledged himself by his place and

Office

Diffinit. de presb. et episc. cap. 1. p. 274.

¶ Presbyteri & Diaconi non ut majorem, sed ut Christi ministerium obsequentur. ap. Sal. p. 275.

Ad id quod scripsit mihi compresbyteri nostri Donatus & Fortunatus, Marcellus & Gurdium, (sic) scribere nihil potui, quando a primordio Episcopatus mei saevierim nihil sine consilio vestro, & sine consensu plebis mee, privata sententiis gerere. Ep. 6. ex edit. Constant. alius lib. 3. ep. 10.

¶ De Pont. lib. 1. c. 6. in resp. ad tertium arg.

[Sed cum ad
vos per Dei gra-
tiam venero,
tunc de iis que
vel gesta sunt,
vel gerenda fi-
ent mutum bo-
nem positis, in
commune tra-
ctabimus, id. ib.
2 Daven. del.
qu. 1. q. 4. 2.

u Annot. in
Cyp. loc. cit.

* Majoritas admittit et in illis, que quidem admi-
nistratio a jurisdictione pendet, seu consensu sub-
jectionali partim constituitur, seu potius ab omni
jellum in eligentes (ex eo quod habet admini-
strationem ordinariam) habere jurisdictionem.
Cano. Carib. l. 2. c. 13. p. 7. sed. Ba. cum pro.
Caf. Major. et off. Henrici. Petina.

* Quamvis Choripiscopi et presbyteris mini-
steriorum communis in dispensatio quedam ta-
men auctoritate veteris legis, que dam novellis
et ecclesiasticis regulis sibi prohibita non erant,
sunt est. presbyteriorum et diaconorum. ut
virginum consecratio, sicut constitutio altaris,
ac benedictio vel unctio. Syn. Hispal. 1. sub Sise-
tula. can. 7. ap. Cent. Maga. cent. 7. c. 9. col. 1. 4. 2.

Office to be bound thereunto; even by that relation wherein the
flood to the Presbyters, and the Presbyters to him, by virtue of
that honour which they mutually owe one to the other. As the Pres-
byters and people did owe this honour to the Bishop, that without
his advice and consent they ought not to do anything; so the Bi-
shop owed the same honour unto them, not to do any thing of his
own head without their counsell and consent. What Cyprian pro-
fesseth concerning himself; the late learned Bishop of Salisbury
confesseth was in all likelihood observed by the rest of the godly Bi-
shops in those dayes. How exorbitant from this rule the practices
of our Prelates have been, the Christian world doth know full well;
and he that should goe about to reduce them unto it, might desert-
edly be accounted a *Magia* *stabilis* *in* *pur* *gator*, as a *Conflans*
speakes, the purger of *Anglia* able so full of dung and filth, that it
would be an *Herculean* labour for to cleane it. True it is that
when the title of Bishop was restrained unto one of the Presbyters,
there did within a litle after begin to be a kinde of reservation and
restriction of some of those acts and Offices, which were before
common to all the Presbyters. This was done for orders sake,
pro bono pacis, for the preservation of the Churches peace, and for
the honour of the Bishop, who being chosen by the consent of the
Presbyters and people, had now a Presidenthip over them; and to

after a sort a Majoritie of administration
ex consensu subjectionali, as *Cardinall*
Cusanus hath it, from the free and volun-
tary act of those who consented to the
prelacion of the Bishop, and subjecting
themselves unto him.

Ordination is one of those acts, the pow-
er whereof the Bishops doe challenge as
one of those Prerogatives which belong to
their Order, yet if you look into the Ca-
nons of the second Councell of *Nicaia*,
which was held at least 600. yeares after
Christ, you shall finde this reckoned up a-
mong other particulars, which the Presby-

ters are there commanded to know are prohibited them by imperi-
all and Ecclesiasticall constitutions. And mark I pray you the reason
why

why they might not meddle with this and other acts, *the power and state of Bishop* as by the *Canons of the Church limited unto one*, and by the same power are these *Offices limited also*, that is the difference of degrees (which the Church had put between a Bishop and a Presbyter) and the honour of the Bishop might be manifested. So the Fathers in that Council. The same is acknowledged in the 7 Council of Aquisgran, an. 816. in the dayes of Ludovicus the first. Ordination is reserved to the Bishops only for authority, or as an ensigne of his honour, and for the prevention of scandals and divisions in the Church, but as for a difference out of the word of God between a Bishop and a Presbyter, they prove at large from the Apostles words to *Titus*, *Timothy*, and *1 Act. 20.* that there is none, but Bishops and Presbyters are one and the same; yet did not this reservation by an Ecclesiasticall canon put the power of Ordination into the hands of the Bishop alone, so as that he might doe it without the concurrence of his Presbyters. But as the Presbyters were by the Canon of the Church prohibited to ordaine, so was the Bishop by the same Canonically constitutions prohibited to doe it without their consent.

² Let not a Bishop ordaine Clergie-men without the counsell of his Clergie, saith the Canon of the Council of Carthage, registered by ³ Gratian in the Canon Law: which who so will be pleased to consult shall find that his Glossator ⁴ *Seweca* doth answer an objection made to the contrary, and proves that the word *plures*, where it is said the Bishop alone may give honour, and alone may take it away, doth exclude other Bishops, but not his own Clergie. So that a Bishop with his own Clergie might ordaine, without the consent of other Bishops, but not doe it alone by his owne pecclesse power, without the rest of his Clergie consenting to, and concurring with him in the action. In this regard it was decreed in the eleventh Council of Toledo in Spain, *When a Bishop doth lay his hands on the head of him who was to be ordained, let all the Presbyters who are present lay on their hands also by the hand of the Bishop.* Presbyters have you see a share with the Bishop in the imposition of

Episcopus in magna congregatione debet, Pontificatus tamen officium non habens, quoniam illi debet episcopi auctoritate canonum preceptum, ut per hoc et discretio gradum, et dignitatem subjugum summi pontificis demone-
stentur.

Y so'm propter auctoritatem summi sacerdotis Clericorum ordinatio et conservatio reservata est, ut a multis disciplina ecclesia vindicata concordiam servaret, scandala generaret. Concil. Aquisgran. ap. Roebel. de reg. Eccl. Gal. 5. tit. 8. ca. 58. pag. 784.

z Episcopus sine consilio clericorum suorum clericos non ordinat. Conc. Carth. 4. cap. 20.
a Dist. 23. ca. 6.
Episcopus.
b Glossa in locum. Vide etiam dist. 23. cap. 1.
c Glo. in 1. 1. Sacerdotes.
c Dist. 23. cap. Presbyter.

d Iren. Forb. lib.
2. cap. 1. pag.
167.
De rep. Eccl.
lib. 1. c. 2. n. 52.
p. 187.

f Tanquam or-
dinantes. seu
ordinem conferentes. ex potestate ordinan-
di divinitus accepta, gratiam ordinato, his ad-
hibito ritibus apprecantes. Forb. ubi supra.

hands at Ordination, which they doe, ⁴ not only as consenting to the ordination, saith Forbescius, (for the consent of the people was also required, yet never were they sharers in this Act of Imposition of hands, and Ordination whereby an Ecclesiasticall power is conferred, as both he and ^e Spalatensis have observed, but by suffrage did they manifest their approbation of the person elected, or their election of him that was to be ordained) ⁵ but as those which were Co-ordinators with the Bishop, and by the power of Ordination received from the Lord, praying for grace to be conferred on

the person ordained by them and the Bishop. This Canonically restriction of Ordination to the Bishop did no more invalidate the power of Presbyters to ordaine by vertue of their Presbyteriall order, then if a Canon should have been made to inhibit a Presbyter to baptize, to preach, to administer the Sacrament of the Lords Supper in the presence, or without the consent of the Bishop, it would be of force thence to conclude that a Presbyter as a Presbyter, by vertue of his order might not performe these Presbyteriall acts and offices. It is

^e Dandi quidem [Baptismi] habet sui summus Sacerdos qui est Episcopus, debinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sui Episcopi qui baptizant, propter Ecclesie honorem. Quod si quis scilicet va pax est. Tertull. de Bapt. 17.

not unknowne that long agoe even in the dayes of ⁶ Tertullian there began to be a reservation of Baptisme to the Bishop, that Presbyters and Deacons might not doe it without the leave of the Bishop, all which was done (on the same ground that Ordination was, as hath been shewed before) for the honour of the Bishop, to whom the Church had conferred honour, and for the Churches peace: yet none did ever inferre from thence that this did properly belong to the Bishop, and that a Presbyter might not doe it, except he had a Bishops licence. But if the ⁷ Master of the Sentences may be believed, albeit Ordination was limited to the Bishop, yet did the ancients argue from the power of administering Baptisme to the power of Ordination: Presbyters might baptize, therefore they might ordaine. Thus did they reason for the power, even then when the execution of the power was by canonicall constitution restrained and shut up, sub certis terminis positus propter melius, as ⁸ Cusanus speaks in the like case, Within certain positive limits and bounds, and that for the good and benefit of the Church, as it seemed unto them which first made, and afterwards continued those limitations & restrictions. Thus much for Ordination.

⁶ Veteres Baptismo ad ordinationem argumentatos fuisse patet ex Augustino. lib. 1. de diff. 2. Sacerd. resp. ad Turri. Soph. p. 640.
⁷ Conc. Carth. 1. c. 13.

Juril.

^a Carth. 1. can.
10.

tified, ^a *Ab uniuersis episcopis datus est; utrum situm a nobis debere servari. It was said by all the Bishops, that we ought to obey forso the Paterns of the cleane Fathers. Whereunto may be added this, that when in the Conncell of Hispanie complaints were made that this rule was broken, it was by the Fathers in that Synod orde-*

^a Statutum est juxta prescorum Patrum decre-
tum, synodali sententia, quid nullus sine consilio
examine deieciendum quemlibet presbyterum, vel
Diononum audeat. Nam multi sunt qui indis-
cussis potestate tyrannica, non aut horitate ca-
nonica damnant. Syn. Hisp. 1. a. 6. Cent. Magd.
cent. 7. cap. 1. col. 142.

rod that ^a *no Bishop should presume to put down a Presbyter or Deacon without ex-amination before a Conncell. The contrary practice of some was adjudged to be the exercise of a tyrannicall power, not of Canonically authority. I will not tire your pa-*

^f Concil. Tribu.
an. 895. c. 1. ap.
Cent. Magd. cen.
9. c. 9. col. 262.

ciencie with repetition of the same decreet revived and confirmed in another ^f Conncell almost 900. yeares after Christ. Only this I will adde; that, This ancient order of the Conncell and consent of six Bishops in the case of a Presbyters deposition from his place, was not neglected by any regular allowance, untill the Apostasie of Antichrist so far prevailed, that the Gospel in the sincere and Orthodox Profession thereof was persecuted under the name of heresie. In this case Gregory the ninth (whose Decretals were published, an. 1230.) gave a ^a dispensation, that the *Diocefan Bishop alone in the pre-*

^a Quoniam Episcoporum numerus ad degradationem Clericorum a Canonibus constitutus, non potest de facili convenire. Concedimus ut sacerdotem, vel alium clericum in sacris ordinibus constitutum (cum pro heresi fuerit, curia seculari relinquendus aut perpetuo immutandus) convocatis Abbatibus, alijsq. praelatis ac Religiosis personis, ac literatis sua Dioecesis de quibus expedire videbatur, suis suis possit Episcopus degradare. Sed. decret. lib. 9. tit. 26. c. 1. In fine. Jan. Can. lib. 1. tit. 26.

sence of his Abbots with some Priests and other religious or learned persons of the Dioceffe might proceede to the sentence. In all cases heresie excepted, the forementioned Ordinances of a Synodall audience for the Deposition of a Presbyter stood in force in succeeding ages, as this learned Canonist *Pantus Lancelornus* hath observed. By this which hath been spoken let

the indifferent and impartial Reader judge of the practices of our Prelates, how strangely exorbitant, that I say not tyrannicall in a very high degree they have been, in their proceedings and execution of that Jurisdiction which they have usurped.

^a Davenant, ubi
supra. Muro episcopalis, &
solum episcopale.

Excommunication is another branch of Jurisdiction, which is claimed also by the Bishops as properly belonging unto them. ^a They tell us this Ecclesiasticall censure was alwaies accounted the *Bishops sword, and the Bishops hand-bolt*: and indeed since they have taken the power thereof into their hands, and as they have managed

it, it hath been an Episcopall thunderbolt, that is to say, *brutum fulmen*, a thunderbolt which doth neither fright nor hurt any; the denunciation of this sentence, being much corrupted (that I say not quite altered) from the practice of the Apostles, and the Church in former dayes, when no punishment was imposed without great lamentation of the multitude, and greater of the better sort, saith the Author of the History of the Councell of Trent; which he doth prove from those expressions of the Apostle, ^b *Ye have not lamented, to separate such an one from among you.* And ^{*} *I feare that at my coming I shall lament many of those who have sinned before.* But as for those amongst us which have challenged this power, and taken it into their hands, they have rather carried themselves like *Solomons* foole or mad-man, which casteth arrowes, firebrands and death, and yet saith, *Am I not in sport.* Concerning this, you are not ignorant what *Hierome* said of old, [†] *A Presbyter may deliver me to Satan if I offend.* However this power hath been by the Prelates wrested out of the hands of Presbyters, yet there have not been wanting those, who, when Prelates were in the height of all their pride, and darted out their thunderbolts as it pleased them, have maintained that the power of denouncing and executing that sentence did belong to the Presbyters. I will only produce a witnesse or two in this, and proceed. [‡] *Marsilius Patavinus* disputing concerning the order of Priesthood, or of a Presbyter (for they are all one) and the power of the Keyes to binde and loose, observeth out of the forementioned Father, *the Church hath those Keyes in the Presbyters and Bishops*, and gives this reason why *Hierome* speaking of this power of the Keyes, doth mention Presbyters before the Bishops, ² *because this authoritie belongs to a Presbyter as a Presbyter primarily and properly.* From the same Author I first tooke notice of this, ^b albeit *Timothy* (a Bishop as our Hierarchists say) was then at Corinth when the Apostle gives charge to excommunicate the incestuous person, yet we heare not a word of command to the Bishop to doe it, but a mandate unto others. *When ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan.* The charge is given to the Presbyters of Corinth, it was not the act of one, but of many who did denounce and execute the sentence on him. Had it been

a Lib. 4. p. 330.

b 1 Cor. 5.

2 a Cor. 12.

† Presbytero licet, si percarere, tradere me Satanae. in Ep. ad Heliod.

‡ Defensor pacis. part. 2. cap. 15. pag. 256.

• Preponens in hoc presbyteros, quoniam auctoritas hac debetur presbytero in quantum presbyter, primo & secundum quod ipsum.

b Cap 6 pag. 165 in init.

c 2 Cor 2. 6.

proper to a Bishop *S^t Paul* would not have so much forgotten himself, as to lay the blame and burthen upon others, and omit the men-

d *Gloss* in *caus. 2 q. 1. ca. 11. verbo Excommuni-*
cet. *Ecclesiarum prelati de jure communi pos-*
sunt excommunicare, licet episcopi jam pre-

tion of him. I finde also that *Bartholo-*
maus Brixniensis and *Johannes Semeca*
both Glossators of the Canon Law, doe
maintaine and prove even out of it, that by

right Presbyters may excommunicate, though the Bishops by cus-
tome and Prescription have taken the power out of their hands.

The same Interpreters of the Canon Law agree in this also. *A Bi-*

e *Non debet Episcopus revocare sententias ex-*
communicationis jussu latas ab eorum prelati,
sine eorum consensu. *Gloss. in dist. 50. cap. 64.*
verb. *injungeret.*

shop ought not to revoke the sentence of
excommunication which a Priest hath on
just ground pronounced, without the
Priests consent which did pronounce it.

By this which hath been spoken, it is evident I hope, that though
there were a Primacy granted, yet at first the Bishop had no Supe-
rioritie of power, much lesse was the power of Ordination or Juris-
diction put into his hands alone: you are not ignorant that *Calvin*,
Bucer, *Bullinger*, and *Zanchie* have maintained that the Bishop
was at first no other then a President of the Presbytery, his Aet and
Office in their meeting, as of the Consul in the Senate, to propound
matters, to gather votes, and declare the resolutions of the Presby-
terie: With what scorn this is rejected by our Episcopall Monarches
you all know, as if they were the meere fancies of *Calvins* braine,
and the testimonie of the rest (which confirme their assertions by
pregnant passages out of antiquitie) slighted, because they are Disci-
plinarians of the *Geneva* cut. If Protestant Divines be not regard-
ed, let us see whether the judgement of a Fryer, and consent of a
Jesuite, will be of more weight with our Prelates; there is good rea-
son to expect it, considering that Papists and Prelates were so linked
together in their votes, (whilest they had any) Jesuites and Bishops
are at this day (as all the world seeth) so neerly conjoynd in their
designes. The Fryer is *Petrus Snavis* that Historian of note, who
discoursing at large touching the Originall of Episcopall power, and
Church censures, as they were anciently administred, tels us, *The*
judgement of the Church, as is necessary in every multitude was to
be conducted by one, who should preside and guide the action, pre-
pose the matters, and collect the points to be consulted on. This care
due to the more principall and worthy person, was always commit-
ted

red to the Bishop. Judge now, I pray you, Fathers and Brethren, whether this be any more, then to be a President of the Presbyterie, or Senate Ecclesiasticall. How the Bishops power came afterwards to be amplified, you shall there finde set forth to the full; the passages are all of them too large for me to repeat, or transcribe; they are worth his reading that shall take paines to peruse them. I shall only mention one, & The goodnesse and charity of the Bishops (mark this, I pray you, he doth not say the Superioritie and power, but the goodnesse and charity of the Bishops) made their opinion for the most part to be followed, and by little and little was the cause that the Church, charity waxing cold, and not regarding the charge laid upon them by Christ, did leave the care to the Bishops; and ambition a witty passion, which doth insinuate it selfe in the stee of vertue, did cause it to be readily embraced. This and much more that Eryer in the same place. The Jesuite is Salmeron, who expounding the words of the Apostle to Titus, I left thee in Creete to ordain Elders in every City, positively affirmeth ^b Paul did not in that place permit Titus alone to set Ministers over the Churches; for this were to invest him with a Kingly power, and by this meanes the right of Election should be taken away from the Churches, and the judgement should be taken away from the Colledge of Pastors. But the Apostle doth only command him, this that he should be President at all elections as a Moderator, that he should by prayer, fasting, and imposition of hands consecrate those that were chosen, as the Apostles themselves did, Act. 6. 13, 14. For this cause did he leave Titus, ordained a Bishop formerly, that he should ordain others, as the Consul or Dictator is said to create Consuls, because they held the Comitia, the Assemblies for the election and creation of them. This being a truth so cleare, confirmed, as you see, by testimonies on all hands, I wonder with what face it is spoken against, and another passage out of Hierome, Tanquam imperator in exercitu, as the Generall in the Army, brought in oborto collo quite against the haire. For Hierome ^b in that place speaks not concerning the power

g. Ibid. pa. 331.

^b Nec hoc loco permittit Paulum Titum ut presideret omnium ecclesiarum ministris: hæc enim regio esset potestas, et intelligendi tolleretur ecclesiæ, et Pastorum collegio iudicium adimeretur. Sed hoc tantum iubet Apostolus ut omnium electionibus presideret tanquam moderator, et eos oratione, jejuniis, et impositione manuum consecraret, ut habet, Act. 6. 13, 14. Ob id enim Titum prius à se ordinatum Episcopum reliquit, ut alios ipse constitueret: sicut dicitur Consul aut Dictator Consules alios creasse, quia Comitia de eorum eligendis habuerunt, Salmeron in Tit. 1. asserit.

i Epist. by div. right. pa. 120.

^b In Epist. ad Evagr.

which

1 Quomodo si exercitus imperatorum sociatur, aut Diaconi eligant de se quem industrium noverint, & Archidiaconum vocent. *ibid.*

2 Sicut ergo Presbyteri sciunt se ex ecclesie consuetudine, ei qui sibi prepositum fuerit subiectos esse: ita Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Domini & veritate Presbyterii esse majores: & in communi debere Ecclesiam regere: in Epist. ad Titum, *cap. 1.*

3 Conc. Hist. 2. art. 6. ap. cent. Magd. cent. 7. cap. 9.

4 Episcopus in quolibet loco sedens stare Presbyterum non paritur. Conc. Corin. 4. can. 34. Episcopus in ecclesia & confesso presbyterorum sublimior sedeat, intra domum vero collegam se Presbyterorum cognoscat. can. 35. ap. Grat. dist. 95.

5 Episcopus non dominum, sed Collegam se presbyterorum cognoscat.

6 Episcopi se sacerdotes esse noverint, non dominos, honorent clericos quasi clericos, ut & ipsi a clericis quasi episcopis honores celerantur. Grat. dist. 95. ca. 1. s. 10 subiectus ex Hier. ad Nepot. epist. 2.

which the Bishop had over the Presbyters, but concerning the manner of his prelation, to wit by the free election of the Presbyters of Alexandria, who did choose one out of their own company, whom they placed in an higher degree, and called Bishop. This forme of prelation, by election, he doth there illustrate by two examples.

1. Of souldiers in an army making choise of a Generall and Commander in chiefe over them; but the Father doth not say the Bishop carried himselfe as a Generall in an army, or had power given him answerable to the power of a Generall. Nay on the contrary he tells

the Bishops in plain termes they ought to governe the Church by the common counsell of the Presbyters, above whom they are by the custome of the Church advanced. 2. He instanceth in the fact of Deacons, making choise of one whom they

know to be industrious, and set him to be Arch-deacon over them. This latter passage is cunningly omitted, the former misalleadged and fraudulently perverted, because the one cuts the comb of Episcopall Dominion, the other, as it is wrested, seemeth at first sight to uphold or favour it. Indeed the execution of Martiall Law hath well pleased them which are now turned Martialisists. It is too well known how they have hang'd up Ministers *ad placitum* at their pleasure, by their suspensions, excommunications, deprivations, by a tyrannicall power, not canonical authority, as was complained of old against some Prelates, in the second Councell of Hispalis. But *ab initio non fuit sic* from the beginning it was not so. The Colledge of Presbyters granted unto the Bishop the chiefeest seat in their publike

meetings, and gave honour to him as to their Senior, and he was commanded to carry himself towards them as toward his Colleagues, by the 9 Canons of the fourth Councell of Carthage, unto which Canons registred by Gratian this Summarie or title is prefixed, *¶ Let the Bishop know that he is not a Lord over, but Colleague of the Presbyters.* In this regard in the same Canonist, the 9 Bishops are commanded to honour their Clergy as Clergy-men, *ut hinc so*

the

the Clergy may reciprocally honour them as their Bishops. And the forementioned Glossator Semeca hath observed that this doth sharply reprove the pride of those Bishops who account them their subjects and underlings, whom they ought to reckon of and call their brethren, and companions.

Last of all, when the Bishop began to be distinguished in name from the Presbyters, and the forementioned Precedentship and Priority was granted him, yet was he not thereby advanced to an order distinct from and superior to the order of Presbyters, but only to an higher degree in that Order. This is cleare by this, that at the first distinction of a Bishop from the Presbyters, there was no new consecration or ordination of the Bishop. *Antonius de Domino*, a man Prelaticall enough, doth confesse, induced thereunto by the cleare testimonie of *Ambrose*, 'at the beginning, whensoever a Bishop dyed, and the Episcopall throne was vacant, there was not so much as an election of him that was to succeed (much lesse any new ordination) but the eldest Presbyter came presently in the room of the deceased Bishop. The words of *Ambrose* are expresse for it. 'The first Presbyters were called Bishops, so as that when he (to wit the first or eldest Presbyter) departed, the next did succeed him. Thus it was at first, the reason why this order was changed, that Episcopacie should be conferred by Election, not by Succession, is there given by the same Father. * Because

the Presbyters which followed were found unworthy to hold that Primacy, the manner of prelation was purposely changed, that worth not order should make a Bishop, being appointed by the judgement of many Presbyters, lest an unworthy person should rashly usurpe the place and honour, and so prove scandalous to many. Yet did he that was named the Bishop remain still a Presbyter, as the same * *Ambrose* testifieth, though he was accounted the Bishop who was the first of the Presbyters, and in that respect the chiefest. As for the Bishops of Alexandria, they had no other Ordination

Hoc est curia superlatum Episcoporum, qui subditos habent filios, cum debuerent appellare fratres. *Caui. 8. q. 1. cap. Quid autem, vel socius cas. 10 q. 3. cap. Cavendum. Gloss. in verb. quasi clericos.*

De respectu. lib. 1. cap. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

* *Quia tamen sequentes Presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatum tenendos, immutata est ratio, proficiente Concilio, ut non ordo sed meritum crearet Episcopum, multorum Sacerdotum judicio confirmatum, ne indignum teneret usurpares, et esset multis scandalum. id. ibid.*

* *Post Episcopum diaconi ordinationem subji- ciunt. Quare nisi quia Episcopi et diaconi una ordinatio est, uterque enim est sacerdos, sed Episcopus primus, ut omni Episcopum Presbyter sit, non omni Presbyter Episcopus. Hic enim Episcopus est, qui inter Presbyteros primus. Ambrosius 1. Tim. cap. 3.*

then the free election of their Presbyters, as is evident from the formerly alleadged passages of *Hierome*. Whence our learned and laborious *Willer* doth acknowledge, *the special consecration of Bishops was ordained only for the dignitie of that calling*. So that what was in the first institution of it devised and ordained meere for the dignitie and honour of that Episcopall function; that is *now* made use of as an argument to prove from thence a distinction of order. In a word *Polydore Virgil* doth confesse, that *anciently in the consecrating of a Bishop, there were no other ceremonies then these that the people met together to give their testimonie and suffrage in the Election, both Ministers and people did pray, and the Presbyters gave imposition of hands*. Which doth manifestly prove that both Bishop and Presbyter were one order nor distinct, even then when there was in some respects a difference made between them. And long after this distinction began, *Johannes Parisiensis* in a treatise of his concerning the power of the King and of the Pope (which was approved by the Sorbon of Paris) maintains that Presbyters are not inferior to Bishops, which he doth prove by this, *they have one and the same ordination, as that noble Frenchman Philip Morney hath observed*. Now admit we yeeld unto our Hierarchists, that the Angel here spoken of is in the forementioned sense and kinde a Bishop, the Senior of the Presbyters, and President of the Presbyterie, as *Beza* taketh it, and Doctor *Reinolds*, whose judgement of this place the Archbishop of Armagh hath published with some additions of his own out of antiquity; yet what is all this to a Bishop in order distinguished from, and superior in power to the Presbyters. Our learned countryman Dr *Reinolds* doth not say, that this Angel or President of the Presbyterie was such a Bishop, nor doth the Reverend Primate of Armagh say that he was of a different order; but only that the name of Bishop was limited to him that had the Presidentship. Who that was hath been expressed before by the clear testimonie of *Ambrose*, to which *Austin* doth agree, saying, *Quid est episcopus, nisi primus Presbyter, hoc est summus sacerdos*? Much lesse doth Dr *Reinolds* affirme that he which had the Presidentship had it by divine right, or undertake to prove or inferre from hence a distinction in Order between

*In Epist. ad
Ephr.*

*Syn. Papi.
cont. 5. q. 3.
p. 177.*

*Epist. by div.
right. pag. 105.
De Invent.
ver. l. 4. cap. 6.
p. 276.*

*Johannes Parisiensis in lib.
de potestate regis & Papali,
quam Sorbon approbavit, affirmat Presbyteros
non esse Pontificum inferiores, quod ad es-
sentialem ministerii dignitatem attinet. Idem
confirmit rationibus hanc, quod eorum ordinatio
confertur in eodem verbis quibus & Episcoporum,
& Apostolorum, vix. Accipite Sp. sanctum, &
Quocumque ligaveritis in terra, erit ligatum in
coelo. Teste D. Plessier lib. de eccl. ca. 1. p. 23.*

*In locum
c Conference
with Hart,
ob. d. d. 17. 3. p.
337.*

*Tom. 4. quest.
ex utroq. mix-
tum cap. 107.*

between a Bishop and a Presbyter by the word of God; for if so he should contradict himself, having expressed his judgement to the contrary, and proved it both by Scriptures, and by variety of other authors. Whether this be not a weak inference, or rather a strange *Non sequitur*; The Angel of Ephesus was a President of the Presbyterie of Ephesus, therefore he was a Bishop differenced in order from and superior in power to the Presbyters of Ephesus, let any reasonable man judge. It is well known that the Speakers of both Houses of Parliament are Presidents, as it were, yet not by their Presidentship advanced to an higher order, the one is a Peere, the other a Commoner, though as Speakers they are in some sort differenced from the Peeres and Commons. The Prolocutor in a Convocation as it stood formerly was by order a Clarke, and no more, though as Prolocutor he had a Presidentship over the Clarks of the Convocation. Such was the preeminence of him that was President of the Presbyterie. In which regard *Beza*, though he grant the Angel here to be the President, yet might justly and on good ground maintain, ^d *that from hence that Episcopall degree, which was afterwards by men brought into the Church of God, neither may nor ought to be established.*

Thus have you, Fathers and Brethren, some of my thoughts concerning this argument of Episcopacie, contracted into as narrow a compass as I could. Wherein I have endeavoured to prove, that the Angel in my text is not a Bishop distinct from a Presbyter in Order, Office, and fixed Superiority, and so to disprove their Institution *de Jure divino*. Concerning which their pretended originall, I cannot but assent unto the judgement of a learned Divine amongst us, one that is well known to be a man of great reading, and insight in antiquity, as also to be no Puritan, ^e *They but abuse themselves and others, that would perswade us that Bishops by Christs Institution have any Superioritie over other men, farther then of reverence, or that any Bishop is superior to another further then positive order agreed upon amongst Christians hath prescribed. For we have believed him that taught us, that in Christ Jesus there is neither high nor low, and in giving honour every man should preferre another before himself: which sayings most excellently cut off all claim to superiority, by title of Christianity, except we can think these things were spoken to poore and private men. Nature and Religion*

* In his letter to Sir Francis Knollys, which was reprinted about the same time that the Archbishop of Armagh published this piece of Dr Reynolds with his own Additions.

d Hinc statim episcopalis ille gradus posset humanitati in ecclesiam Dei in vestram curam nec potest nec debet, Beza in loc.

e M. S. de schismate.

agree in this, that neither of them hath an hand in this heraldry of Secundum, sub & supra. All this comes from composition and agreement of men amongst themselves. Wherefore this abuse of Christianity, to make it a Lackey to ambition, is a vice for which I have no extraordinary name of Ignominie, and an ordinary I will not give it, lest you should take so transcendent a vice to be but triviall. Thus the forementioned Divine clearly overthrowing their superiority by Divine right; from which if our Prelaticall men be beaten, let them not wonder that they should be cashiered as Usurpers and Intruders. For, not to insist on their doome out of the book of God, we will be content to take them at their owne word, if they dare stand to it, and let them have their option. You know what a Bravado the Humble Remonstrant hath made, as being willing to put it to this issue, if they be not able to prove their Divine Institution, they are content to be hissed out of all Christian Congregations. The like brag and challenge is made by a late Patron of Episcopacie, who seemeth to be very neere of kinne to the Remonstrant in confidence and silken language. As for continuance in their places and dignities *jure humano* by the Law of man. First, of all they scorne (you see, and all the world knowes it) that tenure, and therefore it is not fit that they should have the benefit of it. Secondly, Though they should be willing to stick to it, yet it is neither convenient nor necessary, that they should here plead custome and prescription, at least wile that the plea should be in force inviolably against an alteration. *Ludovicus Arelatensis* in his speech against *Panormitan* in the Councell of Basil having proved out of the Fathers that by the Word of God there is no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter, hath foretold the Possibility of changing this frame of government brought into the Church merely by custome. Especially when the inconveniencies of that custome, which came in by degrees, and was embraced at first under a plausible pretence of good and benefit, shall be discovered, and the burthen of it become insufferable. This is that which *Beza* doth intimate upon my text, that the *presbiter* or President should not have been perpetual; however ^h one of late looking on his words with an Episcopall paire of spectacles, bliseth himselfe at the reading of them, as if some foul feind or other did fright him, threatening to pull the Mytre off his head, the Rocher off his backe, and wrest the Crozier

Staffe

f Bishop Hall,
part. 2. §. 10.

p. 129.

¶ Si prout Hieronymo placet,
Episcopi sunt
sola consuetudine
prelato presbyteri, ut si fieri
potest ut consuetudinem
relat contraria
consuetudo.

¶ En. Syl lib. 1.
de gest. conc. Basilap
Orth. Gra. in fascia rer. ex-
pet. fol. 12.

Bishop Hall,
loc. cit p. 125.

Staffe out of his hands. Let the impartiall and unprejudicated Reader peruse his words, and if I mistake not, you will finde no more but this he shewes by the evil consequences which followed, viz. the tyrannies of Prelates, and promotion of Anichrist, to the ruine of the Church and confusion of the whole world almost, which followed upon that perpetuall Presidentship; that it should not have been perpetuall; he doth not question whether it were perpetuall or not, nor say it was not, as the Prelate doth wrest his words; but saith it appeareth now at length it ought not to have been, for as much as it proved in the end of such dangerous consequence, and so pernicious unto both Church and States. If on the fore-mentioned, and other grounds which might be named, we all agree to renounce it, and cast it off, we herein doe no more, then what we have a dispensation for from a great Master of the ceremonies (yet one whom for his learning, and elaborate paines against the Papists I shall ever honour) who, having maintained the Position of Protestants concerning the indistinction of a Bishop and Presbyter by the Word of God by the testimonies of Papists themselves (as his usuall course is) and vindicated it from the imputation of Arianisme and Heresie, doth indeed dislike a schismaticall opposition against Episcopacy, and the practise of the Church therein, desiring it should be observed holily and with humility, yet with this proviso. *Scilicet ut hoc remedium schismatis non producat the poison of tyranniam.* So that by his own concession, when once the remedie is turned into poyson, and so become not only as bad but also worse then the disease, it is then by all means lawfull and possible to be expelled. If this practise not but our Hierarchists will still quarrell and complaine of schismes, faction and disorderly proceedings; I shall return them the same answer which Dr. *Bilson*, a man sufficiently Hierarchicall, gives the Jesuites, who complained that matters of Religion were in *Queene Elizabeths* dayes established by a Lay Parliament (who were not so meddle with Church affaires) without consent of the Prelates and their popish Clergie. *The Christian Printer, who which you will, that first received, and afterwards restored the faith in their Empires, and King domes, eyed not themselves to the voyces and sufferages of their Clergie which were in possession of their Churches.*

Imò ne perpetuum quidem esset necessarium oportuisse, sicut exorta inde tyrannia oligarchica (ut supra apertè est Antichristiana bestia) corrumpere cum totum non ecclesie, modo sedentium totum orbis pernicio, nunc tandem declarat. Beza in Apoc. 2. 2.

Ab sit ut prax in Ecclesiastice cam, que ad tollendum schisma instituta sunt, per schisma percurrere velimus, et non potius eam sancte et humiliter celebramus: dum modo (quod in ecclesia vestra Patres conciliorum graviter dolebant) schismatis remedium non pariat venenum tyrannidum Morit. Apo. Cath. lib. 1. cap. 33. in fine.

I D. ser. betw. Christ. subiect. & unchrist. rebell. part. 2. p. 299. edit. Lond. an. 1586.

but oftentimes removed them without counsell or common consultation. And a little after, why restrains you truth to the assemblies, and sentences of Popes and Prelates, as though they must be gently entreated and fairely offered by Christ, before he might attempt or should recover his own. When the Jesuites reply, We would have things done in order. The Doctor returneth them this answer, Call you that order where Christ shall stand without doores: till your Clergie consent to bring him in? Afterwards, when the Jesuites urge a Commission and lawfull authoritie; He shal it seeme to preach (saith the Doctor) may not hold his tongue till my Lord the Pope (you may thinke if you please on him, who would faine be re-invested in that title, which once his Predecessor had, being accounted, *alterum orbis Papa*, the Pope of the other world) and his mytted fathers can intend to meet, and list to consent to the ruine, as they conceive, of their dignities & liberties. Despise you Councils? say the Jesuites: By no meanes, saith the Dr., so long as they be Councils, that is sober & free conferences of learned & godly teachers: but if they waxe wanton against Christ; and will not have truth received till they have consented, which is the disposition of our Prelates and their adherents at this day, we reject them as conspiracies of the wicked, which no Christian ought to reverence. Thus farre Doctor Bilson. The conclusion of Clemangis in his complaint of the exorbitancies of Prelates shall close up my discourse, *Expergiscere Domine tandem aliquando*; Awake, O Lord, at length; looke downe upon us; pittie us and visit thy Church with thy salvation. Heale her, for there is none but thou canst cure her, Powre into her wounds the wine of reproofe, and oyle of consolation. Take thy fanne into thy hand, and thoroughly purge thy floure which is contaminated with so greivous and such impure defilements. Purge thy vineyard which is exceedingly over-grown with thornes. Make as of old a whip of small cords, drive the money-changers out of the Temple, cast out the buyers and sellers, and exterminate out of the limits of thy Church all the wicked merchantes, unlesse they repent, amend and reforme; Smite the Gehazites with leprosie. Cast downe and dash in pieces the Simonites, with their master Simon, which are flowne so high, and by the ministerie of Satan mounted up, so that none can pull them down unlesse thou be pleased so doe it. Or if we must have an English Letanie to be used in all

Collegiate

Pag. 300.

Pag. 301.

Tya B. de Prae-
fatis. Sim. in
fine p. 166.

Convent and Cathedrall Churches and Chappels seeing our Prelates grow so harden-faced as to tell us, their Jurisdiction is no other but *charitie managed the censures before so* *Episc. by div. right, p. 137.* *charitie doth it self*; yet I think you all know, and so doe others also, that these proceedings have been so charitable, that we may truly say of them, what once *Hierome* did of the Bishops in his dayes, *they were more like to Lions roaring among the sheep, then like shepherds set over the flock*; or what *Didacus Stella* of the Prelates in his time, when in charitie they have come to visit, *they come as the Taylor doth to visit his Prisoners, that he may extort his fees, see whether they be fast bound or not, and to lay more bolts on their heeles*) were I fit to give advice to so grave and learned an Assemblée, I should desire this might be one branch of the Letanie, if we have any: *From Papall tyrannie, and Prelates Charitie, Good Lord deliver us.* With this directorie; Let all the people say, *Amen.*

F I N I S.

Errata:

Page 3, in marg. *propter lege propter*, *ibid lin. ult. Clement. lege Clemangis*, p. 4, line 7, *lice. loco*, p. 14, l. 23 *Hierodantia. Hierodoulia*, p. 18, in marg. *esse* l. ult. *ibid. lin. 14* *Ad 4. de di. p. 24, l. 26.* Kingdome in. l. Kingdome of Heaven in. *ib.* in marg. *Sau. l. Sum. ib. lin. 30.* because they are, they hold, *h.* because they hold p. 38, l. 22. doth necessarily, *h.* doth not necessarily.

As for the rest, if there be any literall mistakes or such like errors, the courteous Reader will easily observe and correct them.